PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI
CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/scottish-journal-of-theology_1952_5

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume Five 1952

V.5
1952

92263

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

PAGE
Ambassador for Christ 106
Angel at the Resurrection 284
Anglican Church on Confirmation 152
Anglicanism, Ecumenical Significance of 374
Anselm—A Revaluation 362
Apostles' Creed 316
Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume 329
Assurance 13
Athanasius on the Holy Spirit 205
Atonement 78, 231
Austin Canons 435
Baptism 125, 130
  Infant 134
  in Missionary Practice 29
Baptisma 163
Barth, Karl 255
  on Ethics 337
Beginning of the Gospel, The 331
Bible 109
  Word Book of the 319
Bible From Within, The 433
Bible Key Words 198
Biblical Doctrine of Election, The 431
Book of the Acts, The 106
Bride of Christ 175
Bultmann 262
Calvin on the Church 419
Calvin's Sermons 424
Catholicity 90
Christ, Life in 306
  Fulness of 90
  Union with 425
Christian Challenge to Philosophy, The 67
Christian Offensive, The 106
Christianity on the Frontier 87
Christianity, Early 302
  and Hinduism 74
Church 90, 127, 200, 417
  Baptism and the 29
  Bride of Christ 175
  Hippolytus on 208
  Mission of 32, 116

PAGE
Church, Nature of - - - - - - - 219
O.T. Doctrine of - - - - - - - 14
World Mission of - - - - - - - 233
Church of England—Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed - - - 439
Church and Ministry - - - - - - - 415
Church of South India, The - - - - - - 446
Commentary on the Gospel of Luke - - - - - - 328
Communion with God - - - - - - - 144
Confessions of the Church - - - - - 85, 261
Confirmation - - - - - - - 35, 148
Congregational Praise - - - - - - - 447
Conversion, Biblical Doctrine of - - - - - 267
Necessity of - - - - - - - - 278
Creator, God the - - - - - - - - 337
Creed, Apostles' - - - - - - - - 316
Cross-roads of History - - - - - - - 106
Das Urchristentum - - - - - - - - 302
Death, Christian View of - - - - - - 307
Deed and Word in the N.T. - - - - - - 237
Deism - - - - - - - - - 2
Deuteronomy - - - - - - - - 106
Dialogue with God, A - - - - - - - 420
Dilthey, Wilhelm - - - - - - - 1
Diognetus, Epistle to - - - - - - - 69
Doctrine, Christian - - - - - - - 89
Doctrine of the Atonement, The - - - - - - 78
Dogmatics - - - - - - - - 81
Dualism, Greek - - - - - - - - 239
Earliest Christian Confessions, The - - - - - - 85
Election - - - - - - - - - 431
Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion - - - - 190
Epistle to Diognetus - - - - - - - 69
Eschatology - - - - - 94, 184, 310, 313, 431
Ethics - - - - - - - - - 339
Evangelical Church - - - - - - - 439
Evangelism - - - - - - - 201, 435
Existenz und Offenbarung - - - - - - - 423
Experiment in Worship, An - - - - - - 330
Faith and Order - - - - - - - 100, 219
Fear and the Resurrection - - - - - - 293
First Epistle of Peter, The - - - - - - - 334
Forgiveness - - - - - - - - 231
Fourth Gospel and Its Message for Today, The - - - - 334
Freedom in Association - - - - - - - 345
before God - - - - - - - - 342
to Live - - - - - - - - 349
Freewill - - - - - - - - - 276

PAGE

MacGregor, Rev. Professor G. H. C.
Review of A. M. Hunter: *Interpreting the New Testament, 1900-1950* 195

MacKinnon, Principal Professor D. M.
Review of Théo Preiss: *La Vie en Christ* 306

Mackintosh, Rev. S. R.
Review of *Revue Biblique* 110

Macnicol, Rev. Professor J. D. A.
Word and Deed in the New Testament 237

Manson, Rev. Professor William
The Son of Man and History 113
Review of E. C. Blackman: *Marcion and His Influences* 299
Review of Rudolph Bultmann: *Das Urchristentum. Im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* 302
Review of C. E. B. Cranfield: *The First Epistle of Peter* 334
Review of W. H. Rigg: *The Fourth Gospel and Its Message for Today* 334
Review of R. V. G. Tasker: *The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews* 334

Muirhead, Rev. I. A.
The Bride of Christ 175

Obendiek, Dr Harmannus
Protestant Theology in Germany during the Past Fifty Years 249

Parker, Rev. T. H. L.
Review of *The Church of England—Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed* 439

Rankin, Rev. Professor O.S.
Review of A. Marmorstein: *The Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume* 329
Review of J. A. Montgomery: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC) 428

Reid, Rev. Professor J. K. S.
Review of J. M. Bates: *A Manual of Doctrine* 89
Review of Jacques Ellul: *The Presence of the Kingdom* 321
Review of *Intercommunion* 100
Review of H. T. Kerr: *Positive Protestantism* 333
Review of A. E. J. Rawlinson: *The Church of South India* 446
Review of Ian Thomson: *An Experiment in Worship* 330
Review of Barbara Wootton: *Testament for Social Science* 212

Ritchie, Rev. Professor A. D.
Review of W. H. V. Reade: *The Christian Challenge to Philosophy* 67

Schniewind, Professor Julius
The Biblical Doctrine of Conversion 267

Smith, Rev. Robert
The Revelance of the Old Testament for the Doctrine of the Church 14

PAGE

STEWART, Rev. Professor James S.
  Review of J. R. Coates: *Bible Key Words* 198
  Review of Floyd V. Filson: *The New Testament against its Environment* 76
  Review of Norval Geldenhuys: *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* 328
  Review of E. K. Lee: *The Religious Thought of St. John* 430

STEWART, Rev. Wm.
  Review of G. D. Henderson: *Church and Ministry* 415

THOMSON, Rev. J. G. S. S.
  Review of A. G. Hebert: *The Bible from Within* 433
  Review of H. H. Rowley: *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* 431
  Review of R. B. Y. Scott: *The Living Interest of the Old Testament* 331

TOMKINS, Rev. Oliver
  Review of Baillie and Marsh: *Intercommunion* 219
  Review of Edwall, Hayman and Macwell: *Ways of Worship* 219
  Review of R. Newton Flew: *The Nature of the Church* 219

TORRANCE, Rev. Professor Thomas F.
  Review of *Calvin's Sermons* 424
  Review of O. Cullmann: *The Earliest Christian Confessions* 85
  Review of *The Fulness of Christ. The Church's Growth into Catholicity* 90
  Review of Adolf Hamel: *Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom* 208
  Review of Heinrich Heppe: *Reformed Dogmatics, set out and illustrated from the Sources* 81
  Review of J. S. McEwen: *Why We are Christians* 316
  Review of Wm. Manson: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* 309
  Review of Alan Richardson: *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* 319
  Review of Gordon Rupp: *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms, 1521* 427
  Review of C. R. B. Shapland: *The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit* 205

TURNER, Rev. H. W.
  Confirmation 148

URQUHART, Rev. Principal W. S.
  Review of H. H. Rowley: *Submission in Suffering* 211

WALKER, Rev. C. R.
  St. Anselm—A Revaluation 362

WILSON, Rev. R. McL.
  Nomos: the Biblical Significance of Law 36

WHITEHOUSE, Rev. W. A.
  The Command of God the Creator 337
  Review of John Baillie: *Natural Science and the Spiritual Life* 80
  Review of R. A. Knox: *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion* 190
  Review of J. A. T. Robinson: *In the End, God* 313

YOUNG, Rev. William G.
  Baptism—Is Missionary Practice Inconsistent? 29

INDEX OF AUTHORS

PAGE

Allan, Rev. Thomas
  Review of R. H. W. Falconer: *Success and Failure of a Radio Mission* 435
  Review of Bryan Green: *The Practice of Evangelism* - - 435

Bailey, Rev. Sherwin
  The Ecumenical Significance of Anglicanism - - - 374

Baillie, Rev. Professor D. M.
  Review of Leonard Hodgson: *The Doctrine of the Atonement* - 78

Baillie, Very Rev. Professor John
  Review of A. L. Drummond: *German Protestantism since Luther* - 304
  Review of Heinz-Horst Schrey: *Existenz und Offenbarung* - - 423

Barclay, Rev. William
  Review of G. B. Caird: *The Truth of the Gospel* - - - 331
  Review of T. W. Manson: *The Beginning of the Gospel* - - 331
  Review of R. W. Moore: *The Furtherance of the Gospel* - - 331
  Review of A. Richardson: *Science, History and Faith* - - 331

Barr, Rev. James
  Review of F. W. Dillistone: *Revelation and Evangelism* - - 201
  Review of A. C. Welch: *Jeremiah, His Time and His Work* - 423

Black, Rev. Professor Matthew
  Review of H. G. Meecham: *The Epistle to Diognetus* - - 69

Boobyer, Rev. G. H.
  Review of *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* - - - 224

Bromiley, Rev. G. W.
  Review of J. W. C. Wand: *What the Church of England Stands For* 441

Brown, Rev. L. W.
  Review of John Mackenzie: *Two Religions* - - - 74

Burleigh, Rev. Professor J. H. S.
  Review of Owen Chadwick: *John Cassian. A Study in Primitive Monasticism* - - - - - - - 70
  Review of J. C. Dickinson: *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* - - - - - 438

Cairns, Rev. Professor David
  Review of F. W. Dillistone: *The Structure of the Divine Society* - 417

Cockburn, Rev. Norman J.
  Review of John Lawson: *Full Communion with the Church of England* 333

Cranfield, Rev. C. E. B.
  St. Mark 4.1-34, Part II - - - - - - 49
  St. Mark 16.1-8 - - - - - - 282, 398

PAGE

Curtis, Rev. Principal Wm. A.
  Review of E. F. Braley: *Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson* 71

De Kretser, Rev. B.
  The Nature of Truth 24

Dickie, Rev. Professor E. P.
  Thomas Halyburton 1

Donaldson, Dr Gordon
  Review of F. Goldie: *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Day* 444

Duncan, Very Rev. Principal G. S.
  Review of W. R. Matthews: *The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century* 188

Gardiner, Rev. T. W.
  Tribute to Professor H. R. Mackintosh 225

Gunn, Rev. George S.
  Review of John A. Mackay: *Christianity on the Frontier* 87
  Review of Anders Nygren: *The Gospel of God* 320
  Review of John Oman: *A Dialogue with God* 420

Johansson, Rev. Nils
  Making Christians by Sacraments 123

Johnson, R. E. C.
  Review of Eugène Masure: *Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique* 324

Katz, Rev. Peter
  The Word of God as Key to Christian Worship 139

Klijn, Dr A. F. J.
  The Term 'Life' in Syriac Theology 390

Knight, Rev. Harold
  The Old Testament Conception of Miracle 355

Lamb, Rev. John A.
  Review of *Congregational Praise* 447
  Review of *I'll Praise My Maker* 447

Lampe, Rev. G. W. H.
  'Baptisma' in the New Testament 163

Macalpine, Rev. A. G.
  Review of William Barclay: *Ambassador for Christ* 106
  Review of L. E. Browne: *Where Science and Religion Meet* 106
  Review of W. P. Cleland: *Cross-roads of History* 106
  Review of T. S. Crichton: *Deuteronomy* 106
  Review of Effie R. Gray: *Let Us Hear the Word of God* 106
  Review of Hamish McIntosh: *The Christian Offensive* 106
  Review of Margaret Murson: *Prophet Harris* 106
  Review of M. D. R. Willink: *The Book of Acts* 106
  Review of Ronald Selby Wright: *What Worries Me* 106

INDEX OF BOOKS

PAGE
Donald Baillie and John Marsh: *Intercommunion* 219
John Baillie: *Natural Science and the Spiritual Life* 80
William Barclay: *Ambassador for Christ* 106
J. M. Bates: *A Manual of Doctrine* 89
E. C. Blackman: *Marcion and His Influences* 299
E. F. Braley: *Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson* 71
L. E. Browne: *Where Science and Religion Meet* 106
R. Bultmann: *Das Urchristentum. Im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* 302
G. B. Caird: *The Truth of the Gospel* 331
Calvin's Sermons 424
Owen Chadwick: *John Cassian. A Study in Primitive Monasticism* 70
Church of England—Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed, The 439
W. P. Cleland: *Cross-roads of History* 106
J. R. Coates: *Bible Key Words* 198
Congregational Praise 447
C. E. B. Cranfield: *The First Epistle of Peter* 334
T. S. Crichton: *Deuteronomy* 106
Oscar Cullmann: *The Earliest Christian Confessions* 85
J. C. Dickinson: *The Origin of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction into England* 438
F. W. Dillistone: *Revelation and Evangelism* 201
F. W. Dillistone: *The Structure of the Divine Society* 417
A. L. Drummond: *German Protestantism since Luther* 304
Edwall, Hayman and Maxwell: *Ways of Worship* 219
Jacques Ellul: *The Presence of the Kingdom* 321
R. H. W. Falconer: *Success and Failure of a Radio Mission* 435
R. Newton Flew: *The Nature of the Church* 219
Floyd V. Filson: *The New Testament against its Environment* 76
Fulness of Christ, The 90
Norval Geldenhuys: *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* 328
F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Day* 444
Effie R. Gray: *Let Us Hear the Word of God* 106
Bryan Green: *The Practice of Evangelism* 435
Adolf Hamel: *Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom* 208
A. G. Hebert: *The Bible From Within* 433
G. D. Henderson: *Church and Ministry* 415
Heinrich Heppe: *Reformed Dogmatics, set out and illustrated from the sources* 81
Leonard Hodgson: *The Doctrine of the Atonement* 78
A. M. Hunter: *Interpreting the New Testament, 1900-1950* 195
Intercommunion 100
Hugh T. Kerr: *Positive Protestantism* 333

PAGE
R. A. Knox: *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion* 190
John Lawson: *Full Communion with the Church of England* 333
E. K. Lee: *The Religious Thought of St. John* 430
J. S. McEwen: *Why We Are Christians* 316
Hamish McIntosh: *The Christian Offensive* 106
John A. Mackay: *Christianity on the Frontier* 87
John Mackenzie: *Two Religions* 74
T. W. Manson: *The Beginning of the Gospel* 331
William Manson: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* 309
A. Marmorstein: *The Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume* 329
Eugène Masure: *Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique* 324
W. R. Matthews: *The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century* 188
H. G. Meecham: *The Epistle to Diognetus* 69
J. A. Montgomery: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC) 428
R. W. Moore: *The Furtherance of the Gospel* 331
Margaret Murson: *Prophet Harris* 106
Anders Nygren: *The Gospel of God* 320
John Oman: *A Dialogue with God* 420
Théo Preiss: *La Vie en Christ* 306
A. E. J. Rawlinson: *The Church of South India* 446
W. H. V. Reade: *The Christian Challenge to Philosophy* 67
Revue Biblique 110
Alan Richardson: *Science, History and Faith* 331
Alan Richardson: *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* 319
W. H. Rigg: *The Fourth Gospel and Its Message for Today* 334
J. A. T. Robinson: *In the End, God* 313
H. H. Rowley: *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* 431
H. H. Rowley: *Submission in Suffering* 211
Gordon Rupp: *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms, 1521* 427
Heinz-Horst Schrey: *Existenz und Offenbarung* 423
R. B. Y. Scott: *The Living Interest of the Old Testament* 331
C. R. B. Shapland: *The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit* 205
Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas 224
R. V. G. Tasker: *The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews* 334
Ian Thomson: *An Experiment in Worship* 330
J. W. C. Wand: *What the Church of England Stands For* 441
A. C. Welch: *Jeremiah, His Time and His Work* 423
M. D. R. Willink: *The Book of the Acts* 106
Barbara Wootton: *Testament for Social Science* 212
Ronald Selby Wright: *What Worries Me* 106

PAGE
Practice of Evangelism, The - - - - - - 435
Prayer, Book of Common - - - - - - 379
Predestination - - - - - - - - 83
Presbyterian Church on Confirmation - - - - - 148
Presence of the Kingdom, The - - - - - - 321
Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century, The - - - - 188
Prophet Harris - - - - - - - - 106
Protestant Theology in Germany - - - - - 249
Protestantism in Germany - - - - - - 304
Reason - - - - - - - - 385
Redemption - - - - - - - - 369
Reformed Dogmatics - - - - - - - 81
Religious Thought of St. John, The - - - - - 430
Repentance, Renewed - - - - - - - 275
Resurrection - - - - - - - 282, 398
  of Body - - - - - - - - 315
  Discrepancies in Account of - - - - - 409
Reunion, Christian - - - - - - - 417
Revelation - - - - - - - - 229
  and Evangelism - - - - - - - 201
Revue Biblique - - - - - - - - 110
Roman Church on Confirmation - - - - - 152
Sacramentalia - - - - - - - - 142
Sacrifice and Priest - - - - - - - 143
Sacrifice du Corps Mystique, La - - - - - - 324
Sakramentskristningen - - - - - - - 123
Salvation - - - - - - - - - 390
Science, History and Faith - - - - - - 331
Science and Religion - - - - - - - 106
Schniewind - - - - - - - - 263
Scripture - - - - - - - - - 382
Second Advent - - - - - - - - 119
Secularisation - - - - - - - - 134
Sermon - - - - - - - - - 226
  and Sacrament - - - - - - - 140
Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland - - - - 444
Sin - - - - - - - - - - 369
Social Science - - - - - - - - 212
Son of Man - - - - - - - - 114
  and History - - - - - - - - 113
South America, Religion in - - - - - - 89
South India Church - - - - - - - 446
Stephen - - - - - - - - - 116
Structure of the Divine Society, The - - - - - 417
Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas - - - - - 224
Submission in Suffering - - - - - - - 211
Success and Failure of a Radio Mission - - - - - 435

PAGE
Syriac Theology, 'Life' in - - - - - - 390
Testament for Social Science - - - - - - 212
Theology, The Task of - - - - - - - 225
Titus - - - - - - - - - - 171
Tomb, The Empty - - - - - - - 398
Tradition - - - - - - - - - 383
Truth, Nature of - - - - - - - 24
Truth of the Gospel, The - - - - - - - 331
Twentieth Century, Christ in the - - - - - 188
Two Religions: Hinduism and Christianity - - - - - 74
Vie en Christ, La - - - - - - - - 306
Ways of Worship - - - - - - - - 219
What the Church of England Stands For - - - - - 441
What Worries Me - - - - - - - - 106
Where Science and Religion Meet - - - - - - 106
Why we are Christians - - - - - - - 316
Without, Those who are - - - - - - 54
Women at the Resurrection - - - - - 282, 293
Word and Communion with God - - - - - 144
Word of God and Worship - - - - - - 139
Worship - - - - - - - 139, 219, 330

PAGE
Full Communion with the Church of England - - - - 333
Fulness of Christ, The - - - - - - - 90
Furtherance of the Gospel, The - - - - - - 331
Galilee in Resurrection Story - - - - - - 289
German Protestantism since Luther - - - - - - 304
German Protestant Theology - - - - - - 249
God, Grace of - - - - - - - - 126
God and History - - - - - - - - 243
Gospel, Wonder of - - - - - - - 227
Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews - - - - - 334
Gospel of God, The - - - - - - - 320
Grace - - - - - - - - - 193
Greek Dualism - - - - - - - - 239
Halyburton, Thomas - - - - - - - 1
Hebrew Mode of Thought - - - - - - 239
Hebrews, Epistle to the - - - - - - - 334
Hebrews, Epistle to the - - - - - - - 309
Heim, Karl - - - - - - - - 1
Herbert Hensley Henson, Letters of - - - - - - 71
Hinduism and Christianity - - - - - - 74
Hippolytus - - - - - - - - 208
Holy Spirit, Athanasius on - - - - - - 205
  Baptism of - - - - - - - - 165
I'll Praise My Maker - - - - - - - 447
Immortality - - - - - - - - 398
In the End, God - - - - - - - - 313
Incarnation - - - - - - - 188, 245
Intercommunion - - - - - - - 100, 219
Interpreting the New Testament - - - - - - 195
Israel and the Church - - - - - - - 20
Jesus Christ, Baptism of - - - - - - 167
  and the Church - - - - - - - 20
  and the Law - - - - - - - - 40
  in Time - - - - - - - - 77
  the Truth - - - - - - - - 27
Jeremiah, His Time and His Work - - - - - 423
Jewish Theology - - - - - - - - 329
John Baptist - - - - - - - - 163
John, Gospel of - - - - - - - - 334
  Religious Thought of - - - - - - 430
John Cassian - - - - - - - - 70
Judgment Day - - - - - - - - 368
Kallistus - - - - - - - - - 210
Kierkegaard - - - - - - - - 257
Kings, Commentary on the Books of - - - - - 428
Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom - - - - - - 208
Law, Biblical Significance of - - - - - - 36

PAGE

Let Us Hear the Word of God - - - - - - 106
Life of Man - - - - - - - - 349
'Life' in Syriac Theology - - - - - - 390
Limits of Freedom - - - - - - - 351
Living Interest of the Old Testament, The - - - - - 331
Lord's Supper - - - - - - 125, 308, 324
Love - - - - - - - - - 199
Luke on Pentecost - - - - - - - 169
Luke, Commentary on - - - - - - - 328
Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms, 1521 - - - - 427
Mackintosh, Professor H. R. - - - - - - 225
Making Christians by Sacraments - - - - - 123
Man and God - - - - - - - - 357
Manual of Doctrine, A - - - - - - - 89
Marcion and His Influences - - - - - - - 299
Mark 4.1-34 - - - - - - - - 49
Mark 16.1-8 - - - - - - - 282, 398
Mark's Gospel: Complete or Incomplete? - - - - 398
Messianic Secret - - - - - - - - 56
Ministry, The - - - - - - - - 415
Miracle, OT on - - - - - - - - 355
Monasticism - - - - - - - - 70
Mystery of the Kingdom - - - - - - 51
Nature of the Church, The - - - - - - - 219
Nature of Truth - - - - - - - - 24
Natural and Revealed Religion - - - - - 11
Natural Science and the Spiritual life - - - - - 80
New Testament, Interpretation of - - - - - 195
  Its Philosophy of History - - - - - - 113
New Testament against its Environment, The - - - - 76
Nomos - - - - - - - - - 36
Old Testament, Allegorical Interpretation of - - - - - 18
  Doctrine of Church in - - - - - - 14
  Living Interest of - - - - - - - 331
  on Miracle - - - - - - - - 355
Origin of the Austin Canons in England - - - - - 438
Palestine - - - - - - - - - 106
Parables - - - - - - - - - 56
Parousia—hope - - - - - - - - 116
Paul - - - - - - - - - 109
  on Baptism - - - - - - - - 170
  and the Law - - - - - - - - 36
Pentecost - - - - - - - - - 169
Peter, Simon - - - - - - - - 288
Peter, First Epistle of - - - - - - - 334
Philosophy and Christianity - - - - - - 67
Positive Protestantism - - - - - - - 333

SCOTTISH JOURNAL
of
THEOLOGY

Volume Five
1952

EDITORS:
T. F. TORRANCE, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol.
J. K. S. REID, B.D.

OLIVER & BOYD LTD.
EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT
LONDON: 98 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN FOR THE PUBLISHERS
BY ROBERT CUNNINGHAM AND SONS LTD., ALVA

THOMAS HALYBURTON[1]

by THE REV. PROFESSOR E. P. DICKIE

CONVERGING lines of thought suggest that it may be timely to revive the memory of the 'great, little man', Thomas Halyburton. There is a new emphasis on the distinction between the knowledge of hearsay and the knowledge of the heart (the distinction which Robert Barclay had in mind when he contrasted 'the saving heart-knowledge' with 'the soaring, airy head-knowledge'). A whole school of thought has grown up around the importance of the I-Thou relation. Karl Heim made a particularly notable contribution to the discussion of the theological problem uncovered by this philosophy, namely the question to what extent our knowledge of God is analogous with our knowledge of the other person; and in his *God Transcendent* he underlines the fact that, when we pass from one 'dimension' of thought to another, it is not by the way of syllogistic reasoning, but by a species of illumination. Side by side with this movement of thought has gone an increasing interest in the work of Wilhelm Dilthey, who, drawing a sharp distinction between the natural sciences on the one hand and the humanistic studies on the other, sums up his wide and stimulating research in the principle, 'We *explain* nature; but we *understand* the human spirit'. That is to say, the world of things we can seek to reduce to laws and rational explanations, for here we are dealing with the universe in its metric aspect, where it can be weighed and measured, counted and analysed; but the spirit of man we cannot capture by those methods, for in that realm only like can know like, and the way to knowledge is the way of sympathetic understanding. When all is known that can be known about another person, there is still the flash of insight by which the other is illumined and comprehended. In the knowledge of men, explanation must give way to experience. Dilthey, as we know, when he comes to discuss knowledge of God, is altogether negative; but his epistemology does not necessitate his sceptical conclusions. It is here that Halyburton has something of particular importance to contribute.

---

[1] A paper read to the School of Theology, St. Andrews, July 1951.

It is through his *Memoirs* that he is best known, and rightly so; for this autobiographical treasure, written by a man in his thirties (who died at 38), is perennially refreshing as what the writer declares to be an 'Account of the LORD's Work with me, and my Way with Him'. It had a lasting effect in the lives of Wesley and Whitefield. Isaac Watts wrote a long letter of recommendation to the first edition, published in 1714, two years after Halyburton's death. 'I find here', Watts says, 'the inward and experimental work of Christianity described at large by a wise, a learned, and an ingenious Man, who seems to have been a strict Observer of his own Spirit and of all the secret Motions of it, and the more secret Springs. Here you may see the crooked and perverse Workings of a carnal Heart in a State of Nature; the subtle Twinings of the old Serpent to keep the Soul from God and His Christ; and all the Counter-workings of sovereign Grace which in the End appear victorious.'[1] He speaks of the uncommon penetration and judgment, but specially—and this is well justified, for Halyburton shows a rare gift of sane and healthy introspection—of the way in which he has laid bare, without offence but indeed with the greatest grace and profit, the secret working of his thoughts. 'So the curious operations of Bees are seen through a Hive of Glass, and the Spectator is at once entertained with Instruction and pleasing Wonder.'[2] Every transcript of the Gospel in the heart of a Christian is a new argument to confirm it.[3]

In the bewilderment which swept over the religious world with the advent of the specious theories of Deism, Halyburton must have been looked on as a David slaying his Goliath, Lord Herbert. Indeed, he has been acclaimed as a hero in poetry—though not very great poetry. The lines are from a poem, 'The Christian Minister', by Dr Thomas Gibbons, of London:

Sheath'd in celestial armour, and lifting high
The sword, invincible, of truth divine,
See HALYBURTON on the mounds, the camp
Of Deism rush, and triumph o'er its powers!

It is odd that deistic thinking should be so persistent. It assuredly is, and among the best Christians too. Ask the average educated layman to give his reasons for believing in God (I have done it so often at conferences) and he will, perhaps in seven cases out of ten, speak in deistic terms. It is not that he has nothing else: he probably has as rich a Christian piety as any other; but, when he is asked to put it all into words, it is to deistic trains of argument that he runs and seldom to speaking of his sins and his Saviour. This may be pure Scottish shyness which is embarrassed in attempting to find words for profound spiritual experience and is readier to express the more manageable philosophical ideas; or it may be due to a lively awareness of the transcendence of God. It is more usual, I should imagine, to find the lay mind drawing attention to the majesty and wonder of the created universe as a proof of God's being, than to hear him putting the emphasis on man's sense of sinfulness as indicating the action upon him of the holiness or the grace of God. The topic of Deism is thus a perennial one.

---

[1] *The Recommendation*, p. iv. [2] ibid. [3] ibid., p. iii.

Halyburton's dates are 1674-1712. Persecution was ending. He was not himself a Covenanter; but his parents had suffered. He was born on Christmas Day, 1674, at Dupplin in the parish of Aberdalgie: his father was George Halyburton and his mother Margaret Playfair. His father, sprung from the family of Pitcur, in Angus, was minister of the parish of Aberdalgie, from which he was ejected in 1662, along with some 300 other ministers in Scotland, for non-conformity. It was another George Halyburton, and a relative, then Bishop of Dunkeld, once a zealous Covenanter himself, now turned to the other party, who carried out the ejection. His mother was a daughter of the manse, her father, Andrew Playfair, having been the first minister of the parish of Aberdalgie after the Reformation. Her husband succeeded him in the parish. When the father died (Thomas was eight at the time) his mother took him, along with her daughter Janet and her son-in-law, to Holland for safety, and there Thomas learned Dutch, and attended the school of Erasmus for Latin. Coming home when he was thirteen (and narrowly escaping shipwreck on the way), he went then to school in Perth, where he behaved well while under his mother's eye, but among his comrades took his liberty. 'Yet still, through the mercy of God, I kept from openly scandalous evils, save once that I remember, I was seized in a garden, with some other boys, taking some fruit. Of this I was much ashamed, and never attempted the like again'—and, he adds frankly, 'not from any real dislike of the sin, but the fears of a discovery.' The chief menace to his mind was the growing power of the Papists, and he had vivid apprehensions of the possibility of a cruel persecution, if political power went that way. His boyish imagination conjured up the vision of an Irish cut-throat threatening him, 'Quit your religion, turn Papist, and you shall live: Hold it and you are dead.' Now he would be ready to recant at once, should it happen; again he would be prepared to offer his breast to the dagger; and sometimes, he confesses, he dallied with the thought of renouncing his faith until better times came round when he might return to it. But, he adds, this possibility gave him no lasting content. These fears haunted him till after the Battle of Killiecrankie, and then his troubles became more and more those of religious doubts. He was comforted to discover that Mr Robert Bruce himself had been 'shaken about the being of God, and how at length he came to the fullest satisfaction'; and, on the other hand, he was awakened to a new seriousness by the words of an old minister who called at his mother's house, asked the boy whether he sought a blessing on his learning, and, getting an ingenuous 'No' in reply, exclaimed, with an austere look, 'Sirrah! Unsanctified learning has done much mischief to the kirk of God.'

Then to Edinburgh, for school and college. About that time, providentially, Clark's *Martyrology* was put into his hand. He loved history and read it greedily. And reading of the patience, joy and courage of the martyrs, he learned something of the strength that is in religion, far beyond the power of mere nature. This, I think, is important for his later development. Deism is not the stuff of which martyrs are made.

The air of Edinburgh did not agree with his mother or with himself. She was advised, and at length resolved, to leave Edinburgh and to go to St. Andrews, 'a place' (I quote) 'more wholesome, and more convenient for my education'. In his student days, he met with many kindnesses, but the greatest were the kindnesses of the Lord, though they were disguised. At a time when his heart inclined to folly and when he was exposed to all the temptations of youth, the Lord trysted him with trouble, and thus kept him from the wilder company of the day and brought him to choose sober comrades. His malady left his mind unaffected and rather furthered than hindered his studies. Being awakened, and finding no peace in any other course, Halyburton drew up for himself a solemn covenant with God, binding himself to serve Him as Israel had done under the dread impressions of Sinai. This 'legal, selfish, anti-evangelical course' did not hold him very long. He tried renewing the covenant when he had broken it; and he tried multiplying his duties; but all the time he was at heart aware that the fault was the familiar one. The heart was not single. All he aimed at was self, to be eased of convictions, and obtain peace from the racking disquietudes he was under. 'I had not the least concern for the Lord's glory, provided I was safe.'[1] At the same time the other perplexity comes on him. He is studying metaphysics and natural theology. This was all good preparation for his future work on Natural Religion and its Insufficiency. He tried by reason to meet the objections of reason. He seemed to be successful, but this brought no peace. 'The most convincing and forcible of those arguments, proceeding upon the absurdity of the contrary conclusion with great evidence, would not allow of anything to be said to the argument, and so extorted an assent; but not enlightening the mind with any satisfying notions and discoveries of the God whom they obliged me to own as existent my mind was not quieted.' He spent weary hours wishing for 'some extraordinary Discoveries' and then remembered, 'Nay, but if one rise from the dead, they will not believe'. He did indeed get 'some things that looked like Return of Prayer', yet 'self was the spring of all. My only aim was to be saved, without any regard had to the glory of the Lord, or any inquiry made, how it might be consistent with it to save one who had so deeply offended.' 'When I was brought into a Strait, I betook myself rather to any Shift, than to Christ; Sin bit me, and yet I loved it.' I 'cannot but look back with Wonder, to the astonishing Patience of God that suffered my Manners so long, and the Steadiness he shews in pursuing His Work notwithstanding many provocations to desist, "still working for His name's sake". All the Creation could not have afforded so much Patience. The Disciples of Christ would have called for fire from heaven. Yea, Moses, the meekest man on

---

[1] Ch. IV.

Earth, would have found more to irritate him here, than at Meribah. Glory to God that we have to do with Him, and not with Man.'[1] He bears witness to 'the Rationalness of God's Way'. The smallest obedience met with great blessing. 'The meanest and most feckless piece of compliance wanted not its reward.' And he found that the Lord's work was power, not force. He might bid him quit many things—but they were things that were no bread. The Lord's work was 'congruous to Reason, yet it was a work far above the Power of Nature. I cannot ascribe its Rise, or Progress to myself; for it was what I sought not, I thought not of, I liked not, yea I hated it, I feared, I avoided, I shifted it; and when all this would not do, I opposed it. For I was of those that rebel against the light.' It was the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes.

The beginning of Part III is another place where the modernised version of Dr Burns has lost the pith of the original. It speaks of his 'deliverance'. Halyburton has a better word; 'The dreadful Strait I was at last brought to, with my Outgate.' He had studied Philosophy three years and 'being interested in it' (the version of Dr Burns: I prefer Halyburton's own 'being tickled with it') he became 'somewhat puffed up with what Progress I had made'. (Yet he had the student's wholesome experience of discovering 'I apprehended I knew more for the first year than ever I thought I knew afterwards'. As knowledge increased, self-conceit decreased.)

He was appointed chaplain to the family at Wemyss and there (partly because of the tauntings of a former schoolmate) he was driven to study the works of the Deists. Already, however, his own past experience began to prove its value. He himself had tried, and tried in vain, this recourse to nature's light. He recognised it for what it was, inadequate and deceptive. His endeavours were not in vain. The Lord often countenanced him. And he exclaims, 'How good a master is God! A word spoken for Him is not lost.' But Halyburton is haunted by a sense of great insecurity. He makes another of his covenants with God—on 23rd November 1697 (he dates it precisely). But oaths and vows are of no avail. 'All these proved physicians of no value.' He arrives at his worst extremity: and he is weary of his own life.

---

[1] Part II, ch. IV.

For the Outgate he cannot give a day or an hour, but it was somewhere about the close of January 1698. Nor can he answer many questions about the way and manner of it. Yet of one thing he is quite certain. The work was a work of the Lord by His Word. It was a manifestation of Christ in His glory. And it was very personal—'The Lord further opened the Gospel call to me, and let me see, that to me, even to me, was "the word of this salvation sent". All this was offered to me, and I was invited secretly to come, and "take of the water of life freely".'

He is very insistent that the work was wrought through the Word. Yet not through any one verse or passage of Scripture. 'All these discoveries were conveyed to me only by the Word. It was not indeed by one particular testimony or promise of the word, but by the concurring light of a great many of the promises and testimonies of the word seasonably set home.' This is interesting to note in connexion with one of the few criticisms passed on the author by Isaac Watts. It is a note on his style. 'I shall be told by some Persons, That there are many Scriptures brought into this History not much to the Purpose.' Watts perhaps admits the fault, but excuses it charmingly—'But forgive a Christian this Practice, who loves to talk in the Language of his God.' It is indeed, as we see now, a part of his strength. Deliverance came through the Word, yet not any one word. There is no superstitious attachment to any verse; no flashing text; nor even any 'Tolle, lege'; but there is prolonged study of the Scriptures and light from many. In addition, he is earnest to note two features of his debt to the Scriptures. The first is that God does the interpreting. The significance comes to him as an illumination. And second, it is not merely a new idea about the world or about the nature of God. It is a new relation between the Divine and the human; not something 'notional' but what today we should describe as a new I-Thou relationship. And this is of the first moment when he comes to examine the position of the Deists. He is to say to them, in effect, There is no point in convincing us that God exists, if you cannot tell us something more about Him; and indeed if you cannot assure us that He will deal mercifully with man's sins, many will wish to be like the fool of the fourteenth Psalm, not believing that there is a God.

He now found that the Lord could use him for good ends. And he was encouraged to find that 'it was about this time that the Lord began to commend Himself and His worship to Lady Anne Elcho, which made her at death bless the Lord for family-worship'. Looking back, he realises how subtle Satan had been in his attacks. Often he would tempt him to give up prayer, since he was not at all sure that there was anyone to whom he could pray. But, although he was hard put to it to defend the practice, he maintained it staunchly. What chiefly enabled him to gain the day was his conviction that God was dealing with his sins. And 'Satan could not easily prevail in persuading me there was no God' while *that* conviction remained.

During the long period of his 'dark exercise' he made up his mind to renounce the ministry. He could never lead others when his own faith was so fragile. But now there came earnest solicitations from the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy and long sessions of counsel and persuasion from other friends and ministers. Finally a call first from South Leith, then from Elie, then from Ceres. He accepted the call from Ceres and on 5th May 1700 was ordained and inducted. In January of the following year he was married to Janet Watson, the daughter of a heritor in St. Andrews. Very moving, here also, is the decision of the young couple one evening before they separated, to spend the next day, each in solitary prayer for guidance before they confirmed their vows to each other. In 1709 there came the invitation to the chair of Divinity in the New College (St. Mary's) in the University of St. Andrews, vacated by James Hadow when he became Principal. Again, after long and sincere and self-mistrusting deliberation, he allowed the call to have its way, and was admitted in 1710, giving as his inaugural lecture an examination of the 'atheistical pamphlet' *Epistola Archimedis ad regem Gelonem.* A copy of the text is treasured in the University of St. Andrews. It is entitled *Oratio inauguralis habita Andreapoli in Scholis Collegii Mariani Borealibus, quinto Calendis Maii* 1710: *In Qua, post exhibitam Rationem suscepti Muneris, Examinatur Schedula nupera, cui Titulus Epistola Archimedis ad Regem Gelonem Albae Graecae Reperta, Anno Aerae Christianae* 1688 *A. Pitcarnio, M.D., ut vulgo creditur, Auctore.*

He speaks of the lack of frankness which circulates this document among young people. The fictitious history contained in it we may perhaps pass over (it may be necessary for the literary style) but we prefer the open attacks of Jews, Moslems, Gentiles. We read of a pretended 'Greek doctor' annotating Greek treatises on anatomy; and the theme of the document is that of the two kinds of religion: 1. *Proprius*, the sect type and 2. *Communis*, the general faith for all mankind with, for example, the universal maxims such as *Quid tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.*

The disquisition is therefore clearly on deist lines, and Halyburton sums up his dismissal of it by noting rather what is absent than what is present: *De Acceptatione nostra apud Deum, aeterna Felicitate et Gloria summi Numinis, altum ubique silentium.*

He did not long occupy the chair, for two years later pleurisy and its consequences in a slender constitution brought on his fatal illness. The meditations and conversations with friends and visitors which occupied his last days have been recorded by others and they form a pathetic and valuable conclusion to the fourth part of the *Memoirs*. Very touching is his thought that he will seem as much out of his element when he enters the glory of the Lord as he had felt in taking up residence first of all in the house of Wemyss. 'When desired to lie quiet and sleep, he answered the people, "I am going to 'sleep not day nor night, but cry, Holy, holy, holy'." ' . . . 'Ah, poor uncomely I, that think shame to come in among that fair company.' Of these last records, Isaac Watts writes, 'Death takes off every possible disguise, and makes us think and speak sincerely; and yet you see him still the same.'

Of the style of his writing there have been contrary opinions. He was given to careful architectonic; and, though the structure sometimes shines through overmuch, it was, says Watts, an advantage, especially compared with much of the writing of the South Britons who abhor structural form in their discourses. He has what Watts calls his 'idiotisms'. We have seen some of them, and have seen also the painful result that follows the attempt to prune them. The edition of 1714 may be hard on the eyes, but it is certainly warming to the heart. Some have taken exception to his 'narrowness', but it is the narrowness of the strongly-flowing stream compared with the breadth of the sluggish, stagnant marsh. He makes an instant appeal to 'sleepy Christians' and wakens them from their slothful slumbers. His *Memoirs* are a religious classic. They exerted a lasting influence on Wesley and Whitefield—and therefore, we note in Scotland, on such movements as the 'Cambuslang Wark'. The character they reveal is 'one not only of unusual penetration and power, but of beautiful simplicity and tender insight'.[1] How striking and how refreshing this must have appeared at the time we may guess by comparing Halyburton with some of the contemporary writers on religious themes. In the seventeenth century we have Zacharie Boyd with his *Last Battell of the Soule*—an author best known perhaps by the parodies of his doggerel verses, e.g.

> And Jacob made for his wee Josie
> A tartan coat to keep him cosie:
> And what for no? there was nae harm
> To keep the lad baith saft and warm.

Or recall his own lines on an O.T. theme:

> Now at the window mind I to look out
> And to consider all the parts about
> If land appears; so far as I can see
> No thing at all is to be seene but sea.

In his 'Aaron's Rod Blossoming or The Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated' George Gillespie is not, perhaps, seen at his best. Some of the authorities whom he quotes are known at least as names; but many may have difficulty with Melchior Adamus, Agorius, Bilson, Genebrardus, Helmichius, Salmeron, and Zonaras.

John Brown of Wamphray—a most affectionate man in private life ('I cannot get my love off that man', one of his friends would say) was less attractive in his writing, as for example in 'The Apologeticall Relation of the particular sufferings of the faithful ministers and professours of the Church of Scotland since August 1660—written for the satisfaction of strangers and encouragement of present sufferers'.

These are all quoted—as fearful examples—in *Essays on Scots Literature*, but a wrong impression is given by the omission of Halyburton. Here is a jewel among much dross.

Looking back now we can see plainly that what was disturbing to our forefathers in Deism was not any of their philosophical opinions—though indeed our forefathers imagined that these were highly dangerous—but rather the unreality of the religion with which they were content. They were 'sleepy Christians' too, though the phrase was mostly used of indifferent theists. They had no 'enthusiasm'. True, there is a connexion between their theological opinions and their lack of fire. God, being purely transcendent, did not seem to summon man to worship. Halyburton notes that, concerning Article II of the deist creed, Herbert says nothing at all—the article which, assuming the first, that God exists, sets forth that He is to be worshipped. His work in refutation of Deism is called 'Natural Religion Insufficient and Revealed Necessary to Man's Happiness in his Present State', and his treatment of Article II is very pleasant: 'Article II. "This one God is to be worshipped." The second article our author has not attempted a sufficient, nay nor any separate proof of: wherefore we go on to the next.'

---

[1] J. H. Baxter, *St. Mary's College Handbook*, p. 18.

They felt more than a suspicion that the adherents of Rome rejoiced in the coming of the deist menace, and they noticed the boastings of the Jesuits 'that they had planted such a drug in England as would soon purge out the northern heresy'.[1] Perhaps, it was thought, even Herbert was secretly an agent for the Papists? Stranger things had happened. He appears indeed at times to *attack* the Romish system; but 'Good watermen can look one way and row another'.

The official answer came from such people as Bishop Butler and Berkeley—and with them Halyburton takes a place—but the lasting and sufficient answer came from real religion and its unconquerable power to commend faith to others. It has been the custom to say that it came chiefly through William Law and John Wesley, but it is clear, apart from the direct influence on Wesley, that Halyburton played a notable part. His *Memoirs* gave the relief of utterance to many troubled souls.

It may be that his work on Natural and Revealed Religion does not show great profundity in theological treatment. (It is doubtful whether that was needed to repel Deism.) But it does show great commonsense and penetration and balance. For example, where he deals with the subject of the good pagan (is he saved or not?—a question which vexes all tender consciences among Christian people) he wisely refuses to go beyond the evidence. Justin Martyr had taken the liberal view: there were some in Halyburton's time who would be as extreme in their views as some Barthians today; but he is content to say, 'Where revelation stops, we are to stop'. Scripture is silent. Reason can determine nothing in it; and therefore disputes about it are to be waived.

---

[1] Burns, p. xxiii.

Similarly, when he deals with the historical theories of the Deists. It is notorious how little sense of history was possessed by the Deists of the period: they read the past in the light of their own epoch, and their 'Golden Age' was one that never was on sea or land, save in their own time and in their own imaginations. Though Halyburton is aware of the absurdity of these theories he has no full-fledged scheme to offer in their place; but we see again and again that he is strenuously feeling after one, and that he is on sound lines. It was only with David Hume that an acceptable theory was worked out—and it came as a death-blow to Deism.

With great insight Halyburton inquires who is to decide, and by what instrument will the decision be made, *which* beliefs are essential to this religion of nature. Why these five only? (Some deists say there are seven.) Can it be because only these five (or these seven) are nowhere controverted? Certainly not; for it is common knowledge that every one of these has somewhere been repudiated. Unprejudiced examination of the knowledge which we have of primitive faiths of the past and ethnic faiths of our day shows no such unanimity as the Deists postulate, concerning the existence of God. Therefore, with the failure of this article, all the other articles fall too. In particular, it is altogether misleading to believe that virtue is always a part of worship.

And, if Halyburton brought commonsense to his work and began to lay the foundation of a better-informed opinion on the nature of non-Christian faiths, he went much farther as a pioneer in his treatment of the nature of faith as it appears in the devout believer. He emphasises, for example, the vanity of reasoning with Satan. He will always evade your argument. This is his anticipation of the psychology of the unconscious, with its bringing into the light of all sorts of rationalisation and sophistication and self-deceiving. Again, he makes a good point in showing that the atheists know none of the *real* difficulties of religion. They are known only to believers. And this has a modern application too; for we know how the atheistic Communist has in truth no leverage at all in dealing with the problem of evil. For him there is in fact no problem of evil. It is only if we believe in a loving God that the anguish of the problem begins to emerge, so that the apparent cruelty of life is perplexing.

Reason is given its due place, for even in the soul's deepest experience there is nothing contradictory to reason; but the real confidence comes when 'Scripture and Experience join'. 'There we have the fullest Confirmation of the Truths that are established in the mouth of two such witnesses.'

Finally of *assurance* he has many wise things to say, and all are from his own experience of a spirit at peace. (1) The believer may find all his own mind in doubt, but he knows throughout his dark experience that in one matter there is no darkness nor doubt—the way of God. (2) The deeper his humility becomes, the stronger is his conviction. It is founded, therefore, on that which is not of man but of God. (3) There is no place for sloth following upon the soul's peace, for it is only in doing one's duty, following the Lord's will, that the sense of safety comes. (4) Assurance, therefore, does not mean 'I am on the way to heaven' but rather 'Whatever happens, I can trust my Lord'.

And so this gracious spirit takes leave of the world in two characteristic utterances, one a humble note of this great little man on himself, the other a word of encouragement to his students from whom he was taken so soon. The first—he had been lying thinking of that pleasant spot in the East Cemetery in St. Andrews, 'Divinity Corner', where the great ones of the past are at rest—and he says, 'I was just thinking on the pleasant Spot of Earth that I'll get to ly in, beside Mr Rutherfoord, Mr Forrester, Principal Anderson. And I'll come in as the little one among them, and I'll get my pleasant George in my hand; and O we'll be a Knot of bonny Dust.' The other to his students, the last words he was able to dictate—'It is better to serve the Lord in the Gospel of His Son than to serve the greatest Princes on Earth, in the highest Station. If God help you in this Service to be faithful, the Reward is too great to be expressed.'

THE RELEVANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

by THE REV. ROBERT SMITH

IN recent discussions the doctrine of the Church has been approached from an unusual angle, by way of certain conceptions found in the Old Testament, such as the Covenant, the Remnant, and the Suffering Servant. In this article I propose to examine the validity and significance of this approach. Is it legitimate to use the Old Testament in this way as a source of Christian *doctrine*? If so we must be quite clear what we are doing and why we are doing it. The importance of these ideas in the history of Israel is generally agreed. Their influence on the New Testament is obvious. But can we make them into normative and formative principles in the life of the Church for all time? In so doing we are not merely borrowing certain moral and religious ideas from the legacy of Israel and adding them to the store of Christian truth. That is a common practice which needs no special justification, because it does not affect the basis of Christian doctrine. Any theological jackdaw can collect whatever suits him from the prophetic writings and use it in building a Christian nest. But we are going to the Old Testament for the foundation plan of the Christian Church. We are applying the promises and attributes which belong by historic right to the sons of Abraham to the mission and destiny of the Church of Christ. There is a big assumption here which is too often taken for granted. It has been a constant complaint of the Jews that Christianity has stolen from them the Old Testament promises and left them nothing but the curses. If we assume the identity of the Church and Israel we must on the one hand be prepared to meet the rival claim of the Synagogue, and on the other we must ask whether the Church is prepared to accept the identification with all that it implies. Does it correspond to the realities of the Church in the world to-day? This approach is evidence of a significant change in theological thinking. But it is something new, at least in our time, and it demands a new interpretation of the Old Testament, and a new interpretation of the Church.

This is bound up with the whole problem of the mystical interpretation of the Old Testament, for it is at least questionable whether we can derive this doctrine from the Old Testament by literal methods of exegesis. A. G. Hebert, for example, makes no attempt to do so, but begins his book, *The Throne of David*, with a vindication of the mystical or theological interpretation. Here and elsewhere he develops an elaborate system of spiritual senses, based on the exegetical rules of the Patristic writers and Thomas Aquinas. But for our purpose here it will suffice to distinguish more simply between three senses, which we may call the literal, the historical, and the spiritual. It is clear that the literal meaning of the Old Testament applies only to the Jews, for it is the sense intended by the writers and understood by their contemporaries. The historical meaning may be shared by Jews and Christians, if we understand it as a sense acquired by the writings when seen in historical perspective. Is there a third, spiritual or theological meaning of the Old Testament which belongs to Christians alone?

This is one tentative way in which the problem might be put. Or we might ask ourselves, can the Old Testament be read as the history of the Church? In order to make the issue plain, let me begin by stating as strongly as I can the case against it. And let us group the arguments for the negative under the same three heads which we shall later use for the positive, and examine in turn the literal or logical, the historical, and the theological standpoints.

(1) Doesn't it make nonsense of the plain, literal meaning of the Old Testament? Let us take an extreme example. The Authorised Version gives as its headings for the Song of Songs such interpretations as this: 'The love of Christ and his Church . . . The Church glorieth in Christ.' Biblical Criticism would eliminate all reference to the Church, and make this lyrical writing a glorification of human love, which had somehow slipped into the Canon to the delight of romantics. Yet now it seems we are restoring the old headings. And there are more important examples. There is endless debate about Isaiah 53 and other 'messianic' passages. Some of them reach visionary heights. But have we any right to refer them to Christ if the

literal meaning points to some historic figure, to some reigning prince or ideal ruler, or to the nation personified? If not, we must say that the New Testament writers in ignorance misinterpreted these passages, but that we now know better. For us the Old Testament is a rich source of primitive cosmology, mythology, comparative religion, folklore, tribal and national history—in fact of everything except Church History. The Church is outside the pages of the Old Testament, and we can only drag it in by doing violence to the literal meaning of words, by glorifying a tribal council into an ecclesiastical assembly, and giving a mystical overtone to every common word in the records of the very mundane behaviour of a very human people. Is it not straining words to see in these pre-Christian documents a reflection of the New Testament *ekklesia*, the congregation of saints?

(2) Is it not also a defiance of the rules of history? The Church is an historical society, a new type of community which owes its origin and emergence to Jesus. As a fully developed organisation it appears only outside the limits of the Bible. From the strictly historical point of view to talk of the Church in the Old Testament is an anachronism. Until recently books on Old Testament theology, although they might deal with religious ideas such as sacrifice which were regarded as a preparation for Christ, contained no reference to the Church. The word does not occur in the index of Wheeler Robinson's textbook, *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.* Similarly the standard histories of the Church, which usually start with a few pages of introduction on the preparation for Christ in Judaism, or more generally on religion at the time of the birth of Christ, treat the Church as a new society whose history begins with Jesus and His disciples. The Old Testament shelves in our libraries are full of books whose very titles show that the use of the Old Testament in the Church and its meaning for Christians has become a problem. The concensus of opinion might be summed up in this way, that the Old Testament is pre-Christian and therefore sub-Christian, and not a safe basis for pure doctrine, although useful for moral edification.

(3) These historical scruples have their influence in the theological field. But there is another factor in the neglect of the Old Testament by dogmatic writers on the Church. It is the

desire to stress the uniqueness and centrality of the revelation in Christ. Adams Brown begins his chapter on the Christian Church with a definition of the Church as 'the religious society tracing its origin historically from Jesus of Nazareth, and finding in Him its bond of union'. The Old Testament is virtually ruled out when he rejects the wider use of the word to include the Jewish dispensation, on the ground that 'it is better *in theology* to restrict the term "Christian Church" to the society which owes its origin to Jesus'. It is plain that the historical standpoint is the dominating factor in this judgment. The word Church is reserved for something definite in post-Christian history. But there is also the conviction that there is no Church without Christ. Whatever anticipations and foreshadowings there may be in the Old Testament are not incorporated in a life until they are incarnated in Christ. And doctrine cannot be derived from disembodied notions. Doctrine surely comes after the event, as an attempt to explain and justify and propagate religious experience. The doctrine of the Church comes late even in the New Testament, and how can we look for it in the Old, since by definition the Church depends on communion with God through Christ?

W. Herrmann could write his whole exposition of Christianity (*Communion of the Christian with God*) without reference to the Old Testament. Is it possible to explain the essential meaning of the Church to the world without turning to the Old Testament for light? If so, we may rightly leave the old behind and concentrate on the new in Jesus Christ.

It is impossible to state these arguments without realising that they are outmoded, although they have not lost all their force. Dissatisfaction with the prevailing doctrine of the Church is one of the reasons which have led to the present reaction in theology. In general it may be said that the experiment of interpreting the Church without reference to the Old Testament has broken down. But the rules for the new appeal to the Old Testament are not yet clear, and there is likely to be much confusion for some time to come. In many ways it seems to me that we are in the same situation as the Church of the second century. We have behind us a period which was mainly concerned with the life of Jesus according to the flesh. But we must pass beyond that if we are to develop an adequate doctrine of the Church. St. Paul himself led the movement away from the Jesus of history to the Christ of faith. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more' (2 Cor. 5.16). The revival of Paulinism was therefore a feature of the beginning of the new movement. One possible outcome of the Christocentric movement is to leave the Old Testament behind with Marcion and to seek for spiritual knowledge with the Gnostics. We have already had our Marcionite movement in Germany and are witnessing a Gnostic phase which will assume many strange forms. In fact we are likely to see revivals of all the second century heresies. And as James Moffatt pointed out, all the heresies of the second century were concerned in some way with the Old Testament. The other possible outcome of the Christocentric movement is that we should do once more what the Church did then, that instead of exalting the originality of Christ at the expense of history and creation, we find a way of harmonising the older revelation of the Law and the Prophets with the new revelation in Christ. This means letting the light of Christ illuminate history in both directions, backwards as well as forwards. *The Witness to Christ in the Old Testament*, the title of Professor W. Vischer's recent book, correctly indicates the aim, though I cannot feel sure that he has found the right method.

The question of allegorical interpretation will have to become as live as it was in the days of Origen. It is an expression of the need for some truth beyond literal and historical facts to satisfy the soul of man. We already have parallels in the symbolism of modern poetry and art, and in the dream symbols of modern psychology. And in fact most ages of the Church have used allegory and symbolism fruitfully, while the literal ages have been invariably barren. The danger of arbitrary and unbalanced interpretation is of course real and serious, and if we are not to be abandoned to subjective driftings, some systematic rules must be found. But the risk must be taken. It is not impossible that the results of historical criticism, by distinguishing various levels of meaning in the development of doctrine, may prepare us to read the Bible more spiritually, using the literal and historical meanings to give depth and height to the Word.

The literal meaning must be the basis of all sound exegesis.

That means that we must take the words of the Bible seriously, subjecting ourselves to the discipline of a message which invades our minds from an alien world, and exposing ourselves to the offence of what the Bible says. In reading inspired scriptures there must always be a tension between God's thoughts and our thoughts. This tension is not due to the intrusion of our modern problems, for it corresponds to the tension in the consciousness of the writers which is characteristic of revelation. This is the justification of a method of interpretation which seeks in all the Scriptures a witness to Jesus Christ, and finds even in the Old Testament His design for the Church. We do no violence to the original meaning if we refuse to be content with the superficial sense of the words, and if we seek to penetrate to the Word behind the words. We are truer to the intention of the authors if we look for meaning beyond in the direction to which they point, than if we accept the meaning most obvious to the modern mind, which tends to rationalise the words in the light of modern ideas. It is not after all so simple to recapture 'the plain, literal sense'. For this involves entering into a world of associations which is lost to us, and sharing something of the original revelation. It may be impossible to do this without relating the truth once revealed in the words of the Bible to the living world of our own experiences.

The study of Biblical language has established the close connexion between New Testament and Old Testament terms, and by discovering the nuances behind the words, has made the literal meaning less prosaic and more capable of a theological interpretation. There is not a theological term in the New Testament which does not come, 'trailing clouds of glory', from the Old Testament. *Ekklesia* is certainly no exception. In the chapter on language in Hoskyns' *Riddle of the New Testament*, *ekklesia* is chosen as the first example of a word whose meaning can only be understood in the light of its Old Testament pedigree. The *ekklesia* of God is the ideal Israel which is 'purchased of old', the People of God which Christian faith sees in every assembly of Christians, the essence of the whole being in every part (see Hort's *Ecclesia*). Much work has been done in recent years on many kindred conceptions—cf. Hebert's list of symbols linked with the Messianic hope: The Son of David, Paradise

Restored, Mount Zion, The Remnant, The Bride, The New Heart and the New Spirit, The Servant, etc. Language studies such as Professor Snaith's *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* and Professor G. A. F. Knight's recent book, *From Moses to Paul*, all help to show that the true lineage of New Testament theological terms points back to the Old Testament. Hoskyns sums it up when he says, in *Mysterium Christi*, that 'no further progress in the understanding of primitive Christianity is possible, unless the ark of New Testament exegesis be recovered from its wanderings in the land of the Philistines and be led back to its home in the midst of the classical Old Testament Scriptures, to the Law and the Prophets'.

One consideration may make us reluctant to identify Israel's history with the history of the Church. It may be felt that there is much in the Old Testament records which is unworthy of Christ. But there is a simple answer to this objection. We face the same dilemma when we meet with imperfections in the Christian community. In spite of the failure of the historical Church to reflect the mind of Christ, we do not hesitate to identify it as His people, and the identity of Israel as the People of God is not less clear.

The results of language study have an obvious influence on the problem of the historical meaning. Again I quote Hoskyns: 'There is no event or utterance recorded of Him (Christ) which does not wholly proceed from conceptions of the Messiahship smelted and sublimed from the ore of the Old Testament Scriptures; and the complete Christological control is not imposed awkwardly on the material, but underlies and penetrates every fragment of it.' If we are to emphasise the importance of taking history seriously, it is plain that the result will be to make us not less but more dependent on the Old Testament.

We have seen that the chief historical objection to the new use of the Old Testament was the fact that the Church owed its origin to Jesus Christ. This brings us to a critical question which figures prominently in all discussions of the doctrine of the Church. Did Jesus found the Church, and if so, when and in what form? This question of the starting-point of the Church can be answered in a new way if we understand it in the light of the Old Testament. The arguments against the founding of the Church by Jesus may be summarised under three heads.

(1) The doubtful authenticity of the only references to the Church in the Gospels (Matt. 16.18, 18.17).

(2) The fact that Jesus worshipped with His disciples in the Temple, and spoke of Himself as sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 15.24).

(3) The eschatological expectation would discourage the founding of any new institution.

Now all these arguments take on a new significance if we realise that the N.T. Church is a continuation and fulfilment of the Israel of the O.T.

(1) What if Jesus did not found a Church because it already existed? Jesus announced the Kingdom of God and the fulfilment of the hope of Israel. God's purpose of salvation required no new institution, but rather a new Israel more faithful than the old.

(2) The mission of Jesus was therefore the restoration of Israel. He lived and died a faithful Jew, and the aim of His life was the perfect fulfilment of the Law. His attitude to the Temple shows that He regarded it as under judgment, and doomed to destruction. But His purpose was to cleanse it and raise it again as 'a house of prayer for all nations'.

(3) This last purpose is the great new feature of the Church, and its realisation begins after the Resurrection. We can only understand the limitation of the mission of Jesus to the Jews if we remember that according to the theology of the Old Testament the admission of the Gentiles belongs to the Messianic age. What happened under the influence of the eschatological expectation was that the conception of Israel was expanded to include all nations. The Pauline Church remained what the disciples of Christ had been, a remnant of faithful Israel.

This view of the continuity of the Church and Israel is illustrated and borne out if we examine the dates most commonly adopted as marking the foundation of the Church. In every case they are linked with some word or association which refers us back to the Old Testament. Shall we say that Jesus founded the Church (*a*) when He called His disciples? He chose them according to the number of the tribes of Israel, symbolising the new Israel that was to be; or (*b*) when He addressed Peter after the Great Confession? (Matt. 16.18). It is followed immediately (vv. 21 ff.) by teaching derived from the Suffering Servant passages of Isaiah; or (*c*) after the Resurrection? ('Whether or not Jesus founded the Church, He was its foundation. Its annals start from His completed mission on earth'—James Moffatt.) Again we find that the Church can only interpret the resurrection with the help of Old Testament doctrines (Luke 24.26 f., Christ on the road to Emmaus; Acts 13.16-41, and other apostolic sermons); or, finally, (*d*) at Pentecost? Peter's explanation of what happened then is based on doctrines drawn from the prophet Joel and the Book of Psalms (Acts 2.16 ff.).

The fact is that the Old Testament was the classical Scriptures of the early Church, while the New Testament was a contemporary sequel and climax to it. The question whether we can use the Old Testament as a source for the doctrine of the Church is answered most conclusively by the example of the New Testament writers, who derive all their doctrine of the Church from that one source. What was their method of interpretation? They took the literal basis of the Old Testament words and created a new theological language. They reviewed the history of Israel in new perspective from the Cross, and the result was a new philosophy of history, a Christocentric view of human destiny. They interpreted both words and history in a new spiritual sense which we recognise as Christian. In seeking to give the proper place to spiritual judgment in our reading of the Bible, we are of course only following the tradition of Protestant theology. The relation between the literal, historical, and spiritual may be illustrated by the methods of archaeology, which of all the scientific and critical studies has been most successful in illuminating the Bible, perhaps because it has recognised its limits. The archaeologist distinguishes different levels in the material (history), and classifies the contents of each (literal), but he cannot assess their relative value. That is the task of spiritual interpretation.

The study of Old Testament doctrines can make three special contributions towards the present discussions on the meaning and mission of the Church. They concern its continuity, its development, and its unity.

Continuity. It is surprising that the Old Testament has been so much neglected in Reformed studies of the Church and Ministry. Protestant theology has often forgotten that there is something more primitive than the primitive Church. In controversy with Rome it has gone back to the New Testament, but Jewish apologetic writers (especially Klausner) are now forcing it back to the Old Testament. It is on this ground that the battle of apostolic succession must ultimately be fought. The real line of continuity in the Church goes through Christ to Israel.

Development. On the other hand the Old Testament shows that lineal continuous succession is not the mark of the true Church. There are many breaks in the succession, and the pattern that runs throughout its history is cruciform (cf. especially the doctrine of the Covenant, the Remnant). A Church which boasted of an *unbroken* line of succession might claim to be the heir of Abraham according to the flesh, but it would be *ipso facto* excluded from the Covenant of grace!

Unity. The problem of Christian unity is simplified when we find the more fundamental basis of unity which the Old Testament reveals. The bond between all the congregations of the Church is that in each is Christ, and that each is Israel. National distinctions fall away when the Church confesses its oneness in Israel. Denominational distinctions disappear when it confesses its oneness in Christ.

THE NATURE OF TRUTH

by The Rev. B. De KRETSER

The consideration of this problem is important for at least two reasons. In many countries there are reports of an increasing decline in public morals and of growing dishonesty and corruption in the life of the body politic. This is taking place at a time when the established religious systems are being subjected to the pressure of pseudo-scientific secularism on the one hand and the claims of modern alternative faiths on the other. Clearly the two developments are interconnected. Yet, to judge from the burden of many public utterances of responsible leaders, including the now important and significant 'Moral Re-armament' Group, the close dependence of moral truth and the truth about the character of reality is not realised. Most people are content to mutter the usual platitudes—'Honesty is the best policy', 'Do please try to be good and speak the truth'. But the problem of truth is more complicated than our naïve moralists would have us believe.

It is possible for our purpose to distinguish between three separate modern ways of understanding truth. The first one is a kind of a 'hang-over' from classical Greek thought. The real world is the ideal world. This 'reality' acts as a constant 'irritant' on the human race. Truth belongs to this world of ideas, and men are truthful to the degree to which they respond to the impinging judgment of Truth. Mahatma Gandhi often gave the impression that he accepted this interpretation of reality. 'I do not say I believe in God', he is reported to have said: 'I believe in Truth. Men argue about God, but they accept Truth.' What Gandhi, and many other people, did not realise is that there are just as many varieties of truth as there are names of gods. In contrast to this idealist approach to truth, we have the 'realist' group. Here there is a denial of the existence of an objective world of ideas. Truth and all other moral standards are the result of social and economic conditioning. Many scientists, Marxists, and even the contemporary school of French Existentialism appear to be in agreement in this respect at least: they hold that the origin of Truth is discoverable within the given material conditions of human life. Consequently, Truth is not believed to possess any absolute or categorical validity.

The scientific approach to our problem needs to be distinguished from the two philosophical attitudes which we have just described, at least as far as scientific method is concerned. Truth to the scientist is the correspondence between 'mental' theories about the nature of the world and the 'facts' of the outside material universe. Theory arises out of the investigation of matter, and it has to be modified, and even rejected, where new facts make theories no longer tenable. This approach to truth is a necessary one. It alone makes it possible for men to enter into conversation with each other on the nature of the tangible world. It prevents obscurantism. It is dynamic. The scientific method has received ample vindication in the triumphs of modern technical civilisation in the industrial world. Unfortunately, it is a method of truth which becomes less and less reliable the more we depart from the impersonal world of 'things' and enter the world of human relations in society. This is one reason why scientists are tempted to treat human beings merely as 'things' or bodies; the problem of truth is thereby made much easier! Today however we are realising that even in the apparently 'objective' world of scientific theory about 'things', the problem of truth is affected by other, and important, facets of human existence. Here we do not need to state the scientific theory underlying the now famous Lysenko controversy. What we do need to note is that in assessing his teaching even Western scientists revealed the fact that their attitude to Marxism itself conditioned their evaluations of Lysenko's work. J. B. S. Haldane, for example, was much less adversely critical of Lysenko's thesis than most other scientists in the West. But then Haldane is a Marxist.

This brings us to the first point we have to make in the attempt to provide a positive and constructive answer to the problem of Truth. The nature of truth is integrally associated with the nature of our faith. Our attitude to the more fundamental question of the nature of reality, which is always in the last resort a faith decision, affects our evaluations of the 'truth' of every given historical event. Take the death of King Charles in the seventeenth century for instance. That he was beheaded is a stark, naked historical fact. On this all historians are agreed. But on the decisive question of the significance of his death, men are unable to agree, and their disagreement is serious in exact proportion to the extent to which their disagreement on more fundamental concerns diverges. Or again, people today plaintively demand the *truth* about the Soviet Union. 'Give us the facts,' they say—as though this were a simple matter! For what are the facts? An average American who visits the U.S.S.R. tells of poor wages, labour camps, and totalitarian propaganda in terms of one ideology. The Dean of Canterbury on the other hand reports of enthusiasm, free co-operation with the government, and better living conditions for the masses of the people. But then the Dean supports the economics of the Left, and the average American does not. Or think again of the ecclesiastical problem raised by the new Church of South India. Generally speaking the verdicts on the results achieved so far vary according to the previous convictions of the judges on the larger issue regarding Church Union schemes in general. Those who favour Union movements bring back favourable reports from South India, those who do not are not too sure that the experiment has justified itself.

Roman Catholics and Marxists understand this interdependent character of Truth and Faith much better than we do. Truth to the Marxist has a pragmatic value, an event is true or false to the extent to which it either furthers or hinders the cause of Marxism itself, which is, of course, *the* Truth. If Stalin, for instance, believes that the cause of Marxism will be advanced if he says now that the Soviet Union is not preparing for war, then this statement is 'true' even if in actual fact Russian factories are turning out more armaments than ever before! In a somewhat different manner, this subordination of all the other facets of human life to a single over-all principle is also to be found in Roman Catholicism. Among the *Rules for thinking with the Church* Loyola demands: 'That we may be altogether of the same mind and in conformity with the Church herself, if she shall have defined anything to be black which to our eyes appears to be white, we ought in like manner to pronounce it black!'

Protestant theologians however must refuse to identify Truth with any historical, political or ecclesiastical system. While they hold that truth, or rather an insight into truth, is possible, yet this understanding can never be simply identified with the Truth itself. This Protestant 'scepticism' derives from the much more radical view of human sin which Protestants hold in comparison with both the Marxists and the Roman Catholics. Protestants believe that sin has affected human reason in such a manner that it distorts even our ultimate judgments and insights into the character of human life and destiny. While historical institutions, both political and ecclesiastical, may be 'possessed' by the truth, they can never claim to be in certain possession of the truth. For all human institutions are liable to succumb to the temptation to distort and exploit the truth for selfish ends.

According to Protestantism, the Truth is Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ alone. In His own Person, in a unique way, He is the ultimate Truth and the ultimate Reality of life. In His person Truth and Reality coalesce and become one. Yet Jesus Christ as Truth, while He is always and continuously relevant to the life of man, maintains a vertical relationship to all historical existence. Judgment is always His prerogative. Precisely because a man's understanding of the Truth depends on a right response to Reality—that is with a faith decision—a man can only speak the truth, in a radical sense, when he is brought into a True alignment with Jesus Christ, who is the Truth. Truth is the consequence of the faith meeting between man and Jesus Christ. Man, who is 'false' because of sin, has himself to be made 'true' in the act of faith before he can speak the truth. This is the Protestant answer to all moralists.

This understanding of Truth has had important historical repercussions. It is no accident that Protestantism has been credited with the rise of the 'democratic' way of life. The Reformers' cry for Religious Freedom, especially in countries like the Netherlands, paved the way for the political democratic institutions of Modern Europe. For the Reformers protested against the Roman Catholic attempt to identify Truth with a particular ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the plea for the right of the individual to be 'free' to allow the Holy Spirit to speak directly to him in Holy Scripture was one which very naturally, and inevitably, occasioned the development of political democracy. Secondly, the Protestant attitude to Truth ought to lead to humility of spirit and temper. We say 'ought' because there are many examples of Protestant Churches seeking to dogmatise about Truth in a manner reminiscent of Roman Catholicism. The only Truth to which all Protestants are bound by constitution to protest, in the midst of the relativities of human existence, is Jesus Christ Himself. For the rest, even in regard to our understanding of the Truth as it is in Him, we must realise that human sin and human finitude infect and limit every interpretation of the Christ of God. Now we see through a glass darkly. Protestants are summoned to be humble, if only because they know that they may be wrong, and the other man right. All that they may be properly certain about is that they know where the Truth is to be found—in Jesus Christ.

And finally, we have to make bold to say that this understanding of Truth has direct bearing on the practical matter of just speaking the Truth. For, in the final analysis, only the man who has been made true can speak the Truth.

This Protestant answer to the nature of Truth has an important relation to the problem of evangelism. We must refuse to join the 'band-waggon' of moral re-armament, where it is assumed that men can speak the Truth, if they would only try. We have to witness instead to the need of men and women to be made true first in Jesus Christ. And we are challenged—and this is important—to be men and women of integrity and therefore provide concrete evidence in support of the claims which we make for ourselves as disciples of Jesus Christ.

BAPTISM—
IS MISSIONARY PRACTICE INCONSISTENT?

by THE REV. WILLIAM G. YOUNG

In his booklet *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism*, p. 46, Karl Barth discusses a curious Lutheran view 'that baptism effects something quite different in children and in adults'. He adds, in a footnote: 'Is it clear in present day missionary work, where there seems to be agreement in a double practice of baptism, that such presupposes a double teaching regarding the meaning of baptism?' As a missionary, I should like to answer emphatically 'No!' When we are baptising a convert from another faith after careful preparation, and when we are baptising the infant child of believing parents, we are doing essentially the same thing.

Let us begin by asking a simple question: What happens in baptism?—or, to put it more pointedly: What does God do at baptism? The answer is simple, but very comprehensive: in baptism God receives a person[1] into the Church. We might perhaps say 'the Church Militant' in order to make it clear that baptism does not guarantee automatic entry to the Church Triumphant—'the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's';[2] it is an 'engagement to be the Lord's', not a guarantee that we *are* automatically 'the Lord's'. It is better, however, to say 'the Church', because at the time of baptism God's act does not exclude the fellowship of the Church Triumphant, which is as much a part of the True Vine as the Church Militant. The baptised person is 'ingrafted into Christ', but the warning of our Lord is always present: 'My Father is the vinedresser. Every branch of mine that bears no fruit he takes away. . . . If a man does not abide in me, he is cast forth as a branch and withers; and the branches are gathered, thrown into the fire and burned.'[1] In saying that God in baptism receives a person into the Church we are not denying that God may receive some people into the Church without baptism; we are not saying that the Salvation Army or the Society of Friends are outside of the Church in the Biblical sense; but we *are* stating that when, in obedience to God's command through Christ, the sacrament of baptism is performed, God in it acts in this way. We believe that it is God's normal and chosen way of adding to His Church.

---

[1] Used simply as a general term to include adult or child.

[2] Shorter Catechism definition.

In baptism God receives a person into the Church. What, then, is the Church? The Church is a people, called by God and in covenant-relationship with Him, with the specific mission of glorifying Him. 'You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.'[2] It is, in fact, 'the Israel of God'.

1. Note that the Church is a people: it is not an aggregate of individuals, not even an aggregate of saved individuals. When we hold to this truth firmly we are saved from the confusion which has risen from the conceptions of a 'visible' and an 'invisible' Church. We need no longer say: 'Visibly, the Church in such and such a place has five hundred members, but God only knows how many of these are really members of His Church—perhaps only fifteen or twenty.' We are also saved from the dilemma of wondering constantly what St. Paul means by the word 'Church', and which of two significances, a 'visible' and an 'invisible', is to be read into the word each time he uses it. It is surely incredible that St. Paul, who uses the word 'Church' forty-four times to describe a visible body of people in a specific place,[3] and six times more to describe the whole visible Christian community,[4] should be referring to something invisible and ideal when he speaks of 'the body of Christ' in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians, and in his many other references to the Church in Ephesians![5] He is setting before the visible Church, whether in Corinth, Ephesus,

---

[1] John 15.1, 2, 6, R.S.V.

[2] 1 Peter 2.9, R.S.V., spelling Anglicised.

[3] e.g. Phil. 4.15; Philem. 3.

[4] e.g. Rom. 16.33; 1 Cor. 10.32.

[5] The question of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians does not really affect this statement, as 'the Body of Christ' is mentioned in 1 Corinthians and Colossians, whose authenticity is not questioned.

or Colosse, or in the world today, the glory of God's purpose for it in Christ; he is not speaking of another, 'invisible', Church. Someone has put the matter bluntly, but forcefully: 'What's the use of a Body if you can't see it?' Let us not, however, lose sight of two truths which the doctrine of the 'invisible' Church was intended to safeguard: that the visible Church on earth is not the whole Church—there is a Church Triumphant; and that not all Church members are Christians.

The Church is a people, and as such has children among its members. Barth himself asserts this in no uncertain voice. 'Take good note', he says, 'that a person who does not believe that in this congregation of his, including those men and women, old wives and children, Christ's congregation exists, does not believe at all in the existence of the Church.'[1]

The Church is a people, called by God, and in covenant-relationship with Him. It is the people of the New Covenant: its parallel with the people of the Old Covenant is drawn again and again in the Epistles. The Church is 'the Israel of God'[2]; statements made about Israel are with little verbal alteration made of the Church. The status and experience of Israel is a type, a picture, a foreshadowing of the status and experience of the Church. They are not to be equated by any means, but the resemblances are very instructive. One of the most interesting and illuminating passages in which this parallel is drawn is 1 Cor. 10.1-13. Here St. Paul says in effect: 'Israel under the Old Covenant had all the outward benefits of Church membership; they had the sacraments—"were all baptised unto Moses . . . did all eat the same spiritual meat . . . did all drink the same spiritual drink"—yet many of them fell into sin, and perished. These things are a warning to us. That we too are members of God's people is no guarantee that we shall escape the wrath of God if we reject Him. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." But if you accept the grace of God, you will be able to stand.' It is clear from this passage that St. Paul thinks of the Church neither as an assembly of 'saved' people, nor as a kind of Noah's Ark which guarantees salvation to all who are inside it, no matter what their lives may be like. The Church is a people of God; its members are 'partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace', and in particular, sharers in the grace of the sacraments; but their privileges and high calling are in themselves no guarantee of ultimate salvation, and are not to be presumed upon. Some of its members are Christ's no doubt; more will be His through the grace of God; but many will reject that grace and be lost. It is worthy of note that in Acts 2.47 these words occur: 'The Lord added to them day by day *those that were being saved* (τοὺς σωζομένους).'[1] In God's economy a work of salvation and a work of rejection goes on inside the Church; some are 'saved', some are 'being saved', some are 'being lost'. It is in the nature of the Church as a people that this should be so. We are not called upon to apologise for this, as though a Church was so much less a Church if it had non-Christian members, but rather to recognise in it God's plan for the furtherance of His glory.

---

[1] *Dogmatics in Outline*, p. 143.

[2] Gal. 6.16.

2. For the Church is not only a people—it is a people with a mission. Our Reforming forefathers were right when they laid their emphasis, in describing the signs of a true Church, on its action, not its composition. The true Church is the place where the Word is rightly preached, the sacraments rightly administered, and discipline rightly maintained. True, this definition does not emphasise enough the missionary calling of the Church—'that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light'. It is a call to declare: the Word has to be rightly preached, not only in the Church, but to the outsiders. The parallel with Israel is again instructive—and the constant lapses of Israel into unfaithfulness, leading to a sifting and the election of a remnant again and again, are not without their counterparts in Church history. 'The chief point to know,' said Sir George Adam Smith, 'is that the election of Israel was an election, not to salvation, but to service.'[2] Not all Israel was saved; not all the Church will be saved; but Israel and the Church are only true to their calling when they are a means of grace. As a nation, Israel ultimately repudiated their calling; as a nation, they are no longer the people of God—the barren fig tree is withered up from the roots. But the remnant, the True Israel, patriarchs and prophets in Old Testament times, apostles and disciples in New—accepted their calling, and so fulfilled the purpose of God. Their calling has been inherited by the New Israel, the

[1] R.S.V. [2] *Isaiah xl-lxvi*, p. 237 (4th ed., 1895).

Church, and in so far as the Church obeys that calling, and is the true Servant of the Lord, so far is it a true Church. As a means of grace its mission is to those inside as well as to those outside. It is fulfilling its purpose only if it is making its Christian members better Christians and leading its non-Christian members to Christ, as well as preaching Christ 'in season and out of season'[1] to those outside its membership. To make a contrast of extremes: a Church, all of whose members are Christians, which is neither a means of grace to these members, nor a means of spreading the Gospel to outsiders, is not a true Church; it is as dead as the barren fig tree, and will be similarly judged, even though its members as individuals be saved 'so as by fire'.[2] On the other hand, a Church which has most of its members as yet not Christian, but in which there are both spiritual growth and conversions, and which is winning people from outside, is a true Church, even though most of its members as individuals are as yet unsaved. It has life; it has a future. These are the conceivable limits; it is unthinkable that there could be a true Church none of whose members was Christian.

It follows that, while the Christian composition of a Church is not normative of its trueness as a people of God, it is a factor that must be taken into consideration if the Church is to fulfil its calling. A particular responsibility falls especially on its adult members. They are its leaders; their guidance and example are set before its children; they are objects of the admiration, indifference or scorn of the outside world. An adult who makes no contribution to the life and witness of the Church is a drone, and if there are too many drones in a Church its effectiveness as a means of grace is inevitably diminished. If the Church is to be God's Servant, 'in whom' He is to 'break into glory'[3]; if it is to be a means of blessing and not simply a recipient—it must have many among its members who are themselves channels through which God's grace can flow to others both inside the Church and beyond its bounds. It is particularly necessary that they be many, in view of the fact that the Church is a people, and its impact on the outside world is likely to be most effective when the Church as a people, and not merely a few members as individuals, are 'declaring'

[1] 2 Tim. 4.2. [2] 1 Cor. 3.15. [3] Isa. 49.3 (G. A. Smith).

God's 'wonderful deeds'. 'The most effective means that can be used in the evangelisation of Muslims,' said Dr Kraemer recently in Lahore, and his words are just as applicable to the evangelistic task of the Church in Scotland, 'is not the missionary, or the few people trained and selected by the missionary, but the local congregation.' In such a situation the adult who has nothing to give, or who is content merely to receive grace and not be a means of grace to others, is not a support to the Church, but a deadweight.

We are now in a position to answer the charge that missionary practice with regard to infant and adult baptism presupposes a double teaching with regard to the meaning of baptism. It is now clear that in view of what happens at baptism, and of the nature and calling of the Church, missionary practice is absolutely consistent. Baptism, whether of the infant or the adult, admits to the Church. God receives the infant through the sacrament; God receives the adult through the sacrament. Baptism in itself makes neither the infant nor the adult a believing Christian. All this is perfectly in keeping with the nature of the Church as a people. At the same time the Church is anxious to ensure that both the infant and the adult will ultimately be channels of grace, members who will share in carrying out the service to which she is called. In the case of the infant, this is a question more of the distant than of the immediate future; the new adult member, on the other hand, ought to be ready to shoulder an adult's responsibility at once. To take a simple analogy: a child in a family is not expected to earn his living at once, but in due course he will be sent to school in preparation for the responsibilities of manhood. If, however, the grown-up daughter of the family wants to get engaged, her father will take good care that the prospective new member of the family is able to earn, and does, earn a livelihood. The Church therefore asks for safeguards: the child's parents must be prepared to confess their faith before the Congregation, and promise to 'bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord' (present missionary practice in the Panjab, which is questioned by some, is to defer the baptism of illegitimate children till they are of age to profess their own faith); the adult must be ready to confess his faith openly before the Congregation (if he is a convert from another faith, he has generally to undergo a long preliminary course of instruction). These precautions taken by the Church are a matter of inspired commonsense, in view of the Church's missionary calling. They do not of themselves affect the validity of the act of baptism, which is ultimately God's act of receiving the baptised person into His Church, but they are very important as human safeguards that the Church may remain true to its election.

It is necessary, finally, to say a word about confirmation. Barth is right in denying that this is a confirmation of baptism, as though it makes up for something lacking in baptism. We Presbyterians deny emphatically that confirmation is a sacrament. It is, nevertheless, an occasion in the life of a Church-member the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated. It is the moment when he confesses his faith openly before the Church, and promises to take an active part in its service of God; it is the moment when he is admitted to be a partaker in the greatest of its means of grace, and deepest token of its fellowship and calling, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It may, in the case of one baptised in infancy, be a confirmation of vows made on his behalf by others. Where an adult is baptised, the usual missionary practice is to confirm him at the same time, which again is logical, seeing he has himself made his public confession and promises. This does not mean that his baptism is different from, or more complete than, that of an infant; in each case the act of God is the same. It is, however, lamentably true that on the mission field the importance of confirmation and its confession and vows has often been sadly neglected. It is surely a great moment when one of God's people, who has been a receiver of grace since his baptism, takes his stand as a believer through that grace, and so becomes himself a channel through which, in the Church, that grace can flow out to others.

NOMOS: THE BIBLICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF LAW

by THE REV. R. McL. WILSON

IN the days of Jesus and of Paul the Jewish religion had become to all intents and purposes a religion of the Law, a religion of which the central feature was the observance of the statutes, the commandments, and the judgments once delivered to the people by the agency of Moses. The Law had indeed so far replaced the Temple at the heart of the Jewish faith that that faith was able to continue and endure, as a religion centred in the Law, even when the Temple had been destroyed. It was the Law that differentiated the Jew from his Gentile neighbours, and the Law was his pride and his glory. Yet it is against the Law that Paul delivers one of the most emphatic and sustained attacks in the entire corpus of his letters.

This fact is all the more surprising when we recall the words of Jesus: 'Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil';[1] or, to go back to the pages of the Old Testament, when we consider the words of the Psalms: 'O how I love thy Law! it is my meditation all the day'; 'Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the Law of the Lord'; 'The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.'[2] And the mystery deepens when we find Paul himself expressly saying, 'The Law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.'[3]

It has been argued that Paul is not representative of the best Jewish thought of his time, that in fact he 'knew only the Judaism that had been contaminated by Hellenism in the Dispersion'.[4] But it is by no means certain that the Dispersion was so radically different from Palestine as this would seem to imply, and moreover there is the further difficulty that Paul himself continued to observe the Law, and that as a Pharisee, to the end of his life.[5] Attempts have been made to resolve this apparent 'inconsistency', but the only real solution lies in a right understanding of the place and significance of the Law in Biblical thought as a whole.

---

[1] Matt. 5.17. [2] Psalm 119.97, 1; 19.7. [3] Rom. 7.12.

[4] See the discussion of this view in Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, ch. 1.

[5] Cf. Davies, op. cit., p. 69 ff.

The Greek word normally used in the New Testament to express the concept of Law is *nomos* (*νόμος*),[1] which occurs in over 160 places, about half of them in the two great controversial epistles, to the Romans and to the Galatians, in which Paul sets out his doctrine concerning the Law. The absence of the word from certain books may be an indication of the completeness of Paul's success in establishing his position, although in some cases it may be due simply to the nature of the subject matter. It is at any rate significant that apart from Romans and Galatians there are only about a dozen occurrences in all the Pauline letters.[2] More important is the fact that *nomos* does not exactly coincide with the Hebrew term for which it is most commonly used. There is a certain area of complete correspondence, but there are also differences in the connotation and associations of the words. In the case of such a man as Paul, therefore, a man of Jewish birth and education but one who wrote in Greek, it is necessary to consider not only the meaning of the words employed but also the significance of the ideas which he is trying to express in the context of Jewish thought.

In the Septuagint, according to Hatch and Redpath, *nomos* is used to render no fewer than eight Hebrew words,[3] but this apparent variety is deceptive. Beyond all possibility of doubt the word is predominantly used as a rendering of the Hebrew

---

[1] According to Professor Dodd (*The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 25 ff.), '*νόμος* is fundamentally "custom", hardening into what *we* call "Law". It does not necessarily imply any legislative authority. It is rather an immanent or underlying principle of life and action.' The ordinary meaning of the term in the period with which we are dealing is however 'law' in the proper sense, i.e. 'either a single statutory enactment or the legal corpus of a given community, whether produced by the codification of existing custom, or laid down by a lawgiver, or enacted by a constitutional authority'.

In the N.T. the word is naturally employed to designate the Jewish Law, especially as set forth in the O.T. By a natural extension, from the Law itself to the books in which it is contained, it is used also for the Pentateuch, or even as a comprehensive description of the content of the O.T. as a whole, this usage corresponding to the Rabbinic use of *torah*. Again, it is used on occasion for the Jewish religion in general, while in a number of cases it refers to the new principle of life and action which was operative in the Christian Church. The meaning thus extends beyond the simple sense of 'law'.

[2] 1 Cor. 9.8, 9.20; 14.21, 34; 15.56; Eph. 2.15; Phil. 3.5, 6.9; 1 Tim. 1.8, 9. Questions of authenticity are here left out of consideration.

[3] מצְוָה Prov. 6.20 (more commonly *entole*; cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 27). [*contd.*]

torah (תּוֹרָה).[1] This is a point of very considerable importance, since *torah* in itself is not primarily a legal term, and to render it by *nomos* is unduly to reduce the range of its significance. In the technical sense of 'the authoritative *direction* given by the priests to the laity on matters of ceremonial observance',[2] or as in Exod. 18.16 of the final judgments given by Moses in cases of dispute brought before him,[3] the translation of *torah* by *nomos* is accurate enough. But *torah* means primarily 'teaching' or 'instruction'; the instruction given by parents to their children (note the parallelism of Prov. 1.8), or the teaching delivered by God to His people, whether by the agency of the prophets or

---

מִשְׁפָּט Jer. 29(49).12 (more commonly *krima* or *krisis*; cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 29 f.).

פִּתְגָם Esther 1.20 (v. 1, *logos*).

דָּבָר Ps. 129(130).5; Jer. 8.9, 34(27).18 (v. 1, *logos*); Ps. 118(119).57 (v. 1, *tas entolas* for *ton nomon*). In a fifth case (Deut. 32.45) two MSS. add *tous nomous toutous*, corresponding to the Hebrew, but the others omit. It may be noted that Deut. 32.44 (nomos = שִׁירָה), marked as doubtful by Hatch and Redpath, can be explained from the use of *nomos* as a musical term. The only clear case of *nomos* = *dabar* is Ps. 118(119).105, and moreover *dabar* is a word of such a very general meaning that it does not give much assistance here.

דָּת 2 Esdras 7.12-26 (six times), Esther 1.8, 13, 15, 19; 3.8 (*bis*); 4.16; Dan. 7.25. In the other reference given by Hatch and Redpath (Prov. 13.15) there appear to be no corresponding words in the Hebrew. Cf. Prov. 9.10, marked as doubtful, where there is apparently a similar interpolation.

חֹק Lev. 6.22(15); Josh. 24.25; Jer. 38.37 (31.35).

חֻקָּה Ex. 12.43; 13.10; Lev. 19.19, 37; Num. 9.3, 12, 14; 15.15; Jer. 51(44).

23. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 27 ff.

There are also seven cases in which Hatch and Redpath mark the identification of the Greek and Hebrew words as uncertain, apart from Deut. 32.44 and Prov. 9.10 mentioned above. In four of these the Hebrew has been paraphrased rather than translated (Job. 34.27; Isa. 33.6; Jer. 23.27; Ps. 58(59).12; the last two cases apparently being due to misunderstanding), while in a fifth there is no corresponding Hebrew (Prov. 3.16a). In Amos 4.5 the occurrence of the word is probably due to a confusion of *todah* with *torah*. The remaining case (Prov. 1.8) is interesting since here three MSS. (א A C) render מוּסָר (instruction, chastisement) by *nomous* (B *paideian*) and *torah* by *thesmous*.

[1] Professor Dodd reckons that of about 320 places where *nomos* occurs in LXX about seven-eighths have *torah* in the Hebrew.

[2] Driver, *Deuteronomy* (I.C.C.), p. 208; cf. ib., p. 401.

[3] Such authoritative judgments, based on custom and precedent, formed the foundation of Hebrew Law, becoming in themselves a series of precedents for future use. Since the priests were the natural guardians of such a developing corpus of Law, the priestly *toroth* would be not only ceremonial but also in part moral and judicial. See Driver in Hastings D.B. 3.64 ff. (Art. 'Law' in Old Testament).

of the priests. It therefore covers not only laws and commandments, not only positive directions on points of morals or of ceremonial, but also teaching on questions of religious or moral duty and the exposition of the true character of religious service, in a word, divine revelation in the widest sense.[1] The Law of Moses in itself was originally given not as a code the observance of which was necessary to salvation but as a set of principles for the guidance of the people of God.[2] It is this sense of the Law as a signal manifestation of the grace and love of God that inspires such utterances as the 119th Psalm, this also which explains the reverence and esteem in which the Law was held among the Jews.

Long before the time of Paul, however, the religion of Israel had become petrified in a rigid legalism. The whole duty of man was comprised in the observance of the Law, and for many what was meant as a blessing had become a curse. When Paul attacks the Law it is not from any mere antinomianism; it is an attack upon a system which in his own experience led only to despair. In this connexion it is of the utmost importance to do justice to the Pharisees. It is all too easy simply to condemn them for their legalism, but that legalism at its best was rooted in loyalty to the God of their fathers and in a deep concern for the fulfilling of His will.[3] It was their chief concern that the Law should be obeyed in every particular, and accordingly there grew up an immense system of interpretation and tradition by which the precepts of the Law received application to every conceivable situation in life.[4] This tradition was accorded an authority as great as, or even greater than, that of the Law itself,[5] and it is here that the "burden" of the Law is to be found.

As Professor J. S. Stewart has put it,[6] 'there were devout hearts in Israel who thanked God day and night for his Law', saints to whom the Law meant everything. But genuine saints are few and far between, and moreover it was the spirit and not the letter of the Law to which they looked. The danger of

---

[1] Dodd, op. cit., p. 31 f.; cf. Driver in H.D.B.
[2] Cf. Elmslie, *How came our Faith*, p. 211 f.
[3] Cf. Moore, *Judaism*, 1, 282 f.
[4] ib., p. 251 ff. (see also index *s.v.* Law).
[5] ib., p. 262.
[6] *A Man in Christ*, p. 93 f. See the whole discussion, pp. 84 ff.

Pharisaism lay in the fact that obedience to the Law could so easily become merely external, the tithing of mint and anise and cummin, to the neglect of the weightier matters of judgment, mercy and faith.[1] A man who took a superficial view might compromise, and be complacently satisfied with his obedience; but on the other hand there were many in Israel for whom the yoke of the Law had become intolerable. Not all Jews were Pharisees, nor were all Pharisees legalists in the bad sense.

It may be said that to a pious Jew the Law left no doubt as to its sufficiency; given the premise that the Law, written or unwritten, contained the Will of God for human life, then obedience to the Law made a man righteous in the eyes of God. But the Law left every ground for doubt in the mind of a conscientious man as to his own sufficiency, and even for those who did not feel it a burden it did not offer any real joy or freedom, still less did it offer power for the conduct of life. On the contrary, even those who prided themselves upon their legal dispensation did not always fully observe the Law,[2] despite the claim of Josephus that, in contrast to the codes of other peoples, the Law 'fulfilled its purpose, being known and obeyed by all'.[3] The Rabbis counted 613 separate commandments, every one of which had to be kept. Every single precept, moral, legal or ceremonial, stood on the same level, and the elaborate casuistry of many generations had worked out for each a multitude of detailed applications. Nor was the situation improved by 'the conviction, deeply rooted in the Jewish mind, that failure at one point meant failure everywhere'.[4] In the words of James, 'Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all'.[5]

It is in the light of this that the New Testament teaching on the subject of the Law must be considered. On the surface the attitudes of Jesus and Paul are far apart, Jesus accepting the Law while Paul rejects it, but in fact they are at one. It must be remembered that Jesus is dealing with Jews, who accepted the Law as a matter of course, while Paul is facing the situation as it affected converts from the Gentile world. Jesus in fact is concerned with the merely formal observance which in keeping the letter of the Law loses sight of the spirit. He therefore sets out to deepen and extend the claims of the Law by interpreting it in accordance with the spirit, in the light of the principles of love to God and love to one's neighbour.[1] It is in this sense that he can speak of a righteousness exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees, a righteousness that consists not in outward conformity to a legal code but in a right attitude of heart and mind. He lays the emphasis not on the outward act but on the motive by which it is inspired. This at once raises the standard required, making the demand one of character and not of isolated acts of conduct. It lays the responsibility upon the individual conscience, compelling men to face decisions for themselves instead of merely conforming to the rule of some authority. But at the same time it removes the burden of observing innumerable minor details. The 'weightier matters' are restored to their rightful place, while the minutiae of ritual and of ceremonial are relegated into the background. This fresh interpretation, however, leads logically to the superseding of the Law by the new principle.

---

[1] Matt. 23.23.

[2] Rom. 2.17 ff.; Gal. 6.13; cf. Acts 7.53; John 7.19.

[3] C. Apion, 2.18.176 ff.; cf. Schürer, *G.J.V.* (1909) 3.552, and the whole section in Josephus, op cit., 2.15.151 ff.

[4] Stewart, op. cit., p. 97.

[5] James 2.10.

Paul on the other hand is concerned with the Law in the scheme of salvation, and is at pains to demonstrate that salvation is attained not by any legalistic practices but as a gift of grace.[2] It is, indeed, true to say that his attack on the Law of Moses was also and at the same time an attack on any and every legalistic system—a point that is often overlooked by those who endeavour to codify the teaching of Jesus and thereby draw up a new 'Law of the Christian life'. The new life in Christ, as Paul discerned, is at once free from the burden of the Law and also fulfils the object of the Law, because the Spirit of Christ offers the necessary inspiration.[3] The teaching of Jesus in this respect cannot be better summed up than in the words of Paul: love is the fulfilment of the law.[4] The standards of the new life are indeed higher than any mere observance.[1] Here both Jesus and Paul stand in the great tradition of the prophets. External forms and rites and ceremonies are integral to any real religion, as expressions of its inward spirit. The danger lies in concentration on these external forms, to the neglect of the spirit, in meticulous observance of rules of practice and procedure to the forgetting of the inward life from which the outward act should spring.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Matt. 5.17 ff.

[2] Cf. Eph. 2.8, which sums up Paul's doctrine in a few words.

[3] Cf. Rom. 6.1-8, 13 (Dodd, *Romans*, p. 84 ff.); Gal. 5.13 ff. Note Rom. 8.3-4.

[4] Rom. 13.10 (cf. 13.8); cf. also Gal. 5.14; James 2.8. Without the article *nomos* may be simply indefinite, or it may refer to Law in general, but attention has been drawn to a use of anarthrous nouns by Paul in a sense which is not merely indefinite but qualitative, i.e. in this case emphasising not the Law as a particular code but rather its character as a legalistic system. The Law of Moses

The main point of Paul's attack is the failure of the Law to justify men: for by works of law (i.e. by legalistic practices of any sort) shall no flesh be justified.[3] This argument is developed alike from the Scriptures and from experience. It was not by 'Law' that the Galatians were justified, it was not by 'Law' that they had received the Spirit, it was not by 'Law' that they received their inheritance of sonship; all this was of grace.[4] A righteousness of God was revealed apart from Law, although it was attested by the Law of Moses and by the prophets.[5] 'By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.'[6] Paul is well aware of the advantage[7] held by the Jew in the possession of the Law, but he is aware also of the facts of our human nature. He is not satisfied with anything short of the

---

is in the writer's mind, but 'the absence of the article calls attention to it not as proceeding from Moses, but in its quality *as Law*' (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 58). See also Slaten, *Qualitative Nouns in the Pauline Epistles* (Chicago, no date), and Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 314 on Heb. 10.8. Slaten lists five cases in which *nomos* is correctly rendered 'a Law', but claims that neglect of the qualitative usage has distorted the meaning in other passages.

[1] Cf. Matt. 5.20; hence Paul's emphasis on the ethical implications of Christian freedom.

[2] Bultmann (*Theol. des NT*, 1.256) observes that Paul never appeals to a saying of Jesus in his debate with the Judaisers, but this does not mean that his doctrine of Justification by Faith is entirely a novelty. Cf. Luke 18.18 ff. and parallels, where Jesus, in reply to the ruler's claim to have kept the Law from his youth up, bids him sell his goods and distribute to the poor. This is not merely an injunction to asceticism, but a test of his loyalty to God. In this case the man's wealth provided the test, but it might be anything that can usurp the place of God. In reply to the question of the bystanders 'Who then can be saved?' Jesus goes on, 'The things which are impossible with men are possible with God', thus throwing men back upon the divine grace as the essential of salvation. Note that this follows immediately after Luke 18.17: 'Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.'

[3] Rom. 3.20; Gal. 2.16, 3.11; cf. Acts 13.39.

[4] Gal 2.16; 3.11; 3.2; 3.18; cf. 4.4 ff. So also the promise to Abraham was prior to the Law: Rom. 4; Gal. 3.6 ff. On the Law and its effects see Rom. 3.19 f.; 5.13-21; 7.7 ff. It should be observed that the two principals in the conflict are Sin and Grace; the Law is only a secondary element (cf. Rom. 5.20).

[5] Rom. 3.21.

[6] Eph. 2.8 f.

[7] Rom. 3.1, 2.

highest standard, and by this standard there is only one conclusion: all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.[1] All alike stand under the same condemnation, because none are able of themselves to fulfil to perfection the requirements of the Law.

The crucial passage for Paul's doctrine of Sin and the Law is the seventh chapter of Romans, where *nomos* is used in two different ways. On the one hand we have the ordinary use denoting the Jewish Law, but some verses are more easily understood from the Greek associations of the word as 'a principle of life and conduct'.[2] The two *nomoi* of 7.22 ff. are in fact conflicting forces at work in the world and in human life. So also in 8.2 the 'Law' of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus and the 'Law' of sin are opposing forces, whereas in 8.34 *nomos* refers to the Mosaic Law in the sense of the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which are actually obeyed where the forces of the Spirit are allowed free play.

According to this chapter, the Law was not in itself sinful, nor contrary to the promises of God; it was rather holy, and righteous, and good,[3] intended to awaken in the minds of men the sense of their true condition, and to promote the penitence and faith, the turning to God, which were necessary before the new life could begin. But its practical effect was to aggravate the trespass, by provoking a reaction against its prohibitions, an increase of sin which could be dealt with only by overflowing grace.[4] The root of the trouble lies not in the Law itself, but in human nature. 'The Law might be noble; but for dealing with the practical situation of a humanity labouring under the thraldom and the inevitable limitations which sin imposes, it was pitifully weak.'[5] It confronted men with a challenge, pointing them along the road by which they ought to travel; 'but actually to set (man) upon that road and give him strength for the journey was more than it could do.'[6]

'I find then a Law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the Law of God after the inward man: but I see another Law in my members, warring against the Law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the Law of sin which is in my members.'[1] This is the situation of man under the Law, as Paul sees it: a tension between the natural inclinations and the obligations of duty, imposed from without. Moreover it is a situation from which no amount of mere legalistic observance can offer any hope of escape. The release is given by the love of God revealed in Christ. 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.'[2] 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.'[3]

---

[1] Rom. 3.23 (cf. Luke 18.19).

[2] Cf. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 25 ff., and especially pp. 36-7. See further Stewart, op. cit., pp. 99 ff.

[3] Rom. 7.12, 14, 16; cf. 1 Tim. 1.8, Gal. 3.21.

[4] Rom. 5.20; cf. Dodd, ad loc.

[5] Stewart, op. cit., p. 111.

[6] ibid.

In the light of this, any attempt to impose the Law upon Gentile converts was a backward step.[4] In Christ they were already at peace with God. As it is put elsewhere, 'if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature'.[5] 'Ye are not under the Law, but under grace.'[6] The Christian is dead to the Law, and a new principle of life is now in operation, the 'Law of the Spirit of life', which is not so much a Law as a principle determined by the Spirit of Christ.[7] 'I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me.'[8] In fact, Christ is the end of Law.[9] The redemption in Christ is all-sufficient, carrying with it the regeneration and renewal of the whole of life.

Paul's view recalls the Old Testament conception of the Covenant, especially as it is presented in Jeremiah's vision of the New Covenant, in which the giving of the Law follows the renewal by grace.[10] This whole conception is rooted in the love of God, and even the failures of Israel will not thwart His purpose. 'God's sure unswerving love will find a way by which even stubborn unrepentant Israel can turn. It will mean new hearts, but God will accomplish even this. Then there will be a turning to God in all sincerity, and loyal obedience to His Law.'[1] For Paul this obedience begins in the new life of the Spirit. The new life is not won by 'works of Law'; the 'works of Law' are the fruit of the new life. The Law of Moses has come to an end, being unnecessary where the Law of God is written in the hearts of men. The true fulfilment of the Law lies not in any scrupulous legalistic obedience but in loving response to the love of God revealed in Christ. The effect of Paul's doctrine, as with the teaching of Jesus before him, is not to destroy the Law, but to establish it on the only true basis.[2]

---

[1] Rom. 7.21 ff. Moffatt renders 'This is my experience of the Law' (cf. Denney in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, ad loc.). The 'Law of my mind' is practically identical with the Law of God, but it is the Law of sin to which he gives obedience. What he wishes to show is how completely he is under the thraldom of sin (Dodd, ad loc.).

[2] Rom. 5.8.

[3] 2 Cor. 5.19.

[4] i.e. as a requirement necessary to salvation. The claim of the Law as the concrete embodiment of the Will of God for human life is still valid, but in the new life obedience is rendered to the Spirit, not to 'the flesh' (cf. Gal. 5.16 ff.).

[5] 2 Cor. 5.17.

[6] Rom. 6.14.

[7] Rom. 7.4; Gal. 2.19; Rom. 8.2; cf. Gal. 6.2. See Dodd, *B.G.*, p. 37. On the relation between the Death of Christ and the sentence of the Law, see Denney in H.D.B., 3.80.

[8] Gal. 2.20 (Moffatt).

[9] Rom. 10.4; on the interpretation, see Sanday and Headlam ad loc.

[10] Cf. Torrance in *S.J.T.* Vol. 1, p. 60 ff., and refs. there to Snaith; cf. also Smith, *Jeremiah*, p. 375 ff. Note that Paul returns not to the prophetic idea of *torah* but to the earlier covenant as revealing the love of God. The *torah* was only a temporary phase. Cf. Gal. 3.17; Rom. 4.13. Dodd observes that Rom. 2.15 reminds us less of Jeremiah than of Stoicism (*B.G.*, p. 36), but it is not without importance that there *was* this common ground. Josephus (loc. cit.) claims the

From this point of view it becomes possible to understand how Paul, despite his strictures, could yet continue to observe the Law. The Law is the claim or demand of God in concrete form,[3] the Will of God for human life, the commandment 'which was ordained for life'. As such, it is 'holy, and just, and good'.[4] The failure of the Law is the failure of human nature under the Law, but the redemption in Christ carries with it, by the indwelling power of the Spirit, the possibility of fulfilment. As it has been put, 'the Jews were set free from the bondage of the Law as a system whereby a man might work out his salvation, but not from the contents of the Law as they reveal the will of God. The Gentiles were set free from sin to become the servants of righteousness.'[5] The difference is that between a rule imposed from without and the 'constraint' of Christ operating from within. The new factor is obedience in personal devotion to Jesus Christ the Son of God, 'who loved

fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy among the Jews of his own day, but this is pure apologetic. At the same time it must be emphasised that the primary element in Paul's doctrine is his own experience, not the rediscovery of forgotten ideas in O.T. theology.

[1] Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, p. 121 f.

[2] Rom. 3.31; cf. 8.3-4; cf. also Matt. 5.17 f. In itself the Law, as a system of religion, was doomed to be no more than a temporary expedient (cf. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 113 ff.). It was a discipline preparatory to the coming of the Christian revelation (ib., p. 115). Cf. Gal. 3.21 ff., with Duncan's notes (Moffatt Commentary, pp. 115 ff.); cf. also Rom. 7.7 ff., with the commentaries ad loc. On the alleged antinomian tendencies of Paul's Gospel, see Stewart, op. cit., pp. 194 ff., Clogg in *Interpretation*, 4.416 ff.

[3] Bultmann, *Theol. des NT*, p. 255. [4] Rom. 7.10, 12.

[5] W. G. D. MacLennan in *Interpretation*, 4.295.

me, and gave himself for me'. Paul never fails to emphasise the ethical implications of faith in Christ, even when he is attacking 'the righteousness which is by Law'. The new life is one of freedom, freedom from the yoke of bondage, freedom from the bondage of the Law, but it is also the freedom of those who are bought with a price, who therefore live no longer unto themselves but unto Christ. There could be no better manual of guidance for the practical conduct of life than the Law interpreted in the spirit of Christ.

Of the references in the other epistles not much need be said. In 1 Cor. 15.56 Paul condenses into six words the teaching of Romans and Galatians on the relation of Law and Sin,[1] while in Philippians he defines his own position, past and present, with regard to the Law[2]: once a Pharisee, legally speaking, blameless by the standard of the righteousness which comes by observance of the Law, but now found in Christ, with no legal righteousness of his own, but only that of faith in Christ. The careful definition in Eph. 2.15 may indicate his sense of the wider meaning of *nomos* as a rendering of *torah*, but the point which matters is the effect of the death of Christ from the point of view of the Gentiles, as abolishing the Law which placed them, in Jewish eyes, beyond the pale.[3] All alike, Jew and Greek, barbarian or Scythian, bond or free, now stand under the same obligation.[4]

The Epistle of James has often been treated as a document of legal Christianity, intended to refute the Pauline doctrine, but on the other hand it has also been claimed as pre-Pauline.[5] The truth however would seem to be that the author is concerned to combat an abuse of Paulinism such as Paul himself had sought to avoid by his insistence on the ethical implications of the Gospel.[1] For present purposes it is enough to note three passages.[2] The *nomos* here is 'a perfect Law, that of freedom', 'a royal Law', 'a Law of liberty', which suggests an implied comparison with another Law, imperfect and a Law of bondage.[3] It may be that this *nomos eleutherias* is to be understood of the Law as fulfilled and completed in Christ, the *nomos basilikos* being 'the Torah as perfected by "the King of the Jews" '.[4] On the other hand this *nomos* appears to be identical with the *logos aletheias*, i.e. not so much the *Torah* as the *logos* or revelation of God in Christ.[5] At any rate this Law which Christians freely and spontaneously fulfil is clearly Paul's 'Law of Christ', and the works which James requires are what Paul calls the fruit of the Spirit. The apparent conflict is due entirely to the difference in their point of view, Paul speaking, in the words of Augustine, of the works which precede faith, James of those which follow it.[6]

---

[1] See Findlay in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, ad loc.

[2] Phil. 3.5, 6, 9.

[3] See Dodd, *B.G.*, p. 34 f., and on the interpretation Scott (Moffatt Commentary) and Salmond (*E.G.T.*) ad loc.

[4] Reference may here be made to the usage of Hebrews, which depends entirely on LXX. In this Epistle the Law is not so much a set of statutes to be obeyed as a religious constitution governing worship (see Dodd, *B.G.*, p. 37, and for the conception of Law implied Denney in H.D.B., 3.81). The original association of Law with the priesthood is recalled by 7.12, where a change in the priesthood involves also a change in the *nomos* (see Moffatt (*I.C.C.*) ad loc.). The use of *nomos* in 7.16 is readily explained by 7.28.

[5] Cf. Denney in H.D.B., 3.82, Moffatt, *Introd.*, p. 468. Mayor, both in his Commentary and in H.D.B., 2.543 ff., argues for the pre-Pauline date, while Michaelis, *Einleitung*, p. 285 (Bern, 1946) assigns the letter to the period before the Gentile Mission of Paul.

To sum up, *nomos* in the New Testament refers primarily to the Law of Moses, the ancestral Law which was the pride of the Jewish people, although there are some cases in which the context points to some other meaning. Christianity began within the Jewish faith, and the first Christians naturally continued to observe the Law of their fathers, but at this period Judaism had become largely a religion of observance, a prey to the attendant evils of formalism, self-righteousness, and complacency, and ultimately the Gospel was incompatible with legalism. The decisive breach was due to Paul, who was chiefly concerned to assert the complete adequacy of the Gospel in the face of the Judaising claim that observance of the Law was also necessary; but the effect of his argument was to exclude statutory practices in any form from the scheme of salvation, although legalism was later to penetrate within the Church.[7]

---

[1] James gives no direct answer to the Pauline doctrine, such as would be expected if he were seeking to refute it; on the other hand, the antinomianism of certain Gnostic sects indicates that Paul's position was in fact misunderstood, despite Rom. 6.15 ff. and similar passages.

[2] *Nomos* occurs in seven passages altogether, twice with the article and referring clearly to the Mosaic Law, and twice in the qualitative sense which is found in Paul (2.9, 10; 2.11 (cf. Rom. 2.25), 4.11). The remaining passages are 1.25, 2.8, 12.

[3] Cf. Mayor, *James*, p. 71.

[4] Oesterley in *E.G.T.*, 4.433.

[5] Moffatt, *Introd.*, p. 464; cf. Mayor, op. cit., p. 60, Oesterley, loc. cit.

[6] Quoted by Moffatt, op. cit., p. 465 (note). On the usage of *nomos* in the Epistle, see Dodd, *B.G.*, p. 39 f.

[7] See Kirk, *The Vision of God*, especially Lecture III.

The ways by which James and the author of Hebrews approached the question were different, but they too came finally to the same conclusion,[1] that in Christ the old things are passed away and all things become new, that in Him is the fulfilment, and therefore the end of Law. The life of the new society is to be one of freedom, 'the freedom wherewith Christ hath made us free',[2] a life in which the Will of God is obeyed, and His Law observed, not by any external compulsion but by the inward constraint of love, because all action and all conduct are inspired by a new principle, the indwelling Spirit of Christ.

---

[1] Hebrews is concerned with the sacrifices of the Temple, which are abrogated by the sacrifice once for all of Christ; in James the Law of Moses is replaced by the 'perfect' Law, which is at the same time a 'Law of freedom'; the latter view is the logical outcome of the attitude of Jesus (cf. Mayor in H.D.B., 2.544 for parallels between James and the Sermon on the Mount).

[2] Gal. 5.1.

ST. MARK 4.1-34

by THE REV. C. E. B. CRANFIELD

PART II

THE structure of this section, which is one of the two large blocks of teaching in Mark (the other being chapter 13), may be indicated as follows:

vv. 1 f.	narrative framework.
vv. 3-8	parable of the sower.
v. 9	link ('And he said') + saying.
vv. 10-13	narrative framework + saying of Jesus followed by link ('And he saith unto them') + Jesus' answer to the disciples' question in v. 10.[1]
vv. 14-20	interpretation of the parable of the sower.
vv. 21-23	link ('And he said unto them') + parable of the lamp and saying about concealing and revealing, followed by the same saying as in v. 9.
vv. 24 f.	link ('And he said unto them') + sayings.
vv. 26-29	link ('And he said') + parable of the seed growing secretly.
vv. 30-32	link ('And he said') + parable of the mustard seed.
vv. 33 f.	narrative framework—about Jesus' teaching in parables.

That this is a composite section is fairly obvious. In v. 1 Jesus is sitting in a boat and in v. 36 he is apparently still in the boat, but vv. 10-20 presuppose a different scene. As things stand it is not clear to whom the teaching in vv. 21-32 was addressed. Are we to conclude from its relation to vv. 10-20 that it was addressed to the disciples alone, or are we to conclude from its relation to vv. 33 f. that it was addressed to the multitude? It seems likely that we have to do here with a number of originally independent pieces of tradition which have been brought together in several stages to form an artificial unity. Vv. 10-20 disturb the unity of scene of a grouping of parables and sayings which is probably itself artificial. But vv. 10-20 themselves are not originally a unit. Vv. 11-20 give a double answer to the disciples' question in v. 10. V. 13 (with the singular 'this parable') presupposes a question about the meaning of the particular parable and would follow on v. 10 quite smoothly. It is true that the plural 'the parables' in v. 10 might suggest a more general question, but it need not; and one wonders whether it represents a correction made in order to make the insertion of vv. 11 f. easier. The link 'And he said unto them' at the beginning of v. 11 looks very much like a stereotyped link or introduction to a logion. Omit vv. 11 f. from this context, and one would never have any idea that anything had been left out! For our present purpose it is not necessary to attempt to determine the exact stages of the evolution of Mark 4.1-34.[1] For the moment it is enough to have shown that vv. 11 f. are an independent piece and are therefore in the first place to be interpreted independently of their present context. Afterwards, of course, they must also be interpreted in their Markan context; for the particular significance that they acquire from their present surroundings is by no means without interest and importance.

---

[1] R. H. Lightfoot points out that in Matthew all trace of failure to understand on the part of the disciples and of any rebuke of them by Jesus has disappeared. So Mark's 'asked of him the parables' becomes 'Why speakest thou unto them in parables?' and Mark's 'Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?' becomes 'Hear then ye the parable of the sower'. Matt. also adds vv. 16 f., which Luke gives in another context, pronouncing the disciples 'blessed'. Cf. also Matt. 13.51. (Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 174 ff., 194 note.) Calvin had noticed this difference (see his *Commentary on a Harmony of Matthew, Mark and Luke*, ad loc.).

Mark 4.11 f.

There are three main questions which concern us here: (1) Do these verses represent an authentic saying of Jesus or are they the creation of the early Church or of Mark himself? (2) If this is an authentic saying of Jesus, what did He mean? (3) What do these verses mean in their present context? Questions 1 and 2 will be most conveniently considered together.

Whether we have here a genuine word of Jesus or a creation of the early Church, it is clear that 'you' must refer either to the Twelve or to the wider circle of disciples indicated in v. 10 by the words 'they that were about him with the twelve'. They are represented as the recipients of a gift which is described as 'the mystery of the kingdom of God'. It is the word 'mystery' here that has put people on the wrong scent. B. H. Branscomb wrote confidently: 'A second source of the idea [that Jesus taught in parables in order to conceal His thought] was supplied by the Hellenistic religions of the day. The thought of hidden, esoteric knowledge which those outside the religion could not know was so familiar that these popular religions of the time are, indeed, known as the "Mystery Religions". . . . The idea of a Christian mystery paralleling those of these various cults is to be found in several New Testament writings. It is presented plainly here. . . . The idea is so exactly that of the Hellenistic religious world that its influence in the formation of the saying can scarcely be denied.'[1] Rawlinson seems to have the same sort of notion—he speaks of '*the "mystery" of the kingdom of God* which only the initiated were intended to understand'.[2] But J. Armitage Robinson's note *On the Meaning of μυστήριον in the New Testament*[3] had been in print since 1904, to warn against this particular false scent! Robinson demonstrated that the use of this word in the New Testament has no *direct* connexion with the heathen mystery cults and that in the New Testament it means, not something that must not be revealed to the uninitiated, but something that could not be known by men except by divine revelation but that, though once hidden, has now been revealed in Christ and is to be proclaimed so that all who have ears to hear may hear it.

---

[1] For this see F. D. Gealy, op. cit., D. W. Riddle, op. cit., and Lohmeyer, *Das Ev. des Mkus*, p. 82 and p. 83, note 1, Jeremias, op. cit., p. 8, note 5c.

Those who have traced the influence of the pagan mysteries in this saying have naturally regarded it as the creation of the Church and not an authentic word of Jesus. C. H. Dodd also argues that the whole of vv. 10-20 must be secondary because it contains 'seven words which are not proper to the rest of the Synoptic record. All seven are characteristic of the vocabulary of Paul, and most of them occur also in other apostolic writers. These facts create at once a presumption that we have here not a part of the primitive tradition of the words of Jesus, but a piece of apostolic teaching.'[4] Now two of these seven words are in vv. 11 f.—viz. 'mystery' and 'them that are without'. It must be said here that as far as 'mystery' is concerned, it would be very precarious to argue that because a word only occurs once in the Gospel, therefore it cannot have been used by our Lord. Moreover, there are several considerations that are relevant. For one thing, if we follow the clues provided by Armitage Robinson, we shall recognise behind the word 'mystery' here the Old Testament word *ṣodh*, which is rendered in the R.V. *inter alia* by 'secret'. 'Surely the Lord will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.'[1] 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his covenant.'[2] 'For the perverse is an abomination to the Lord: but his secret is with the upright.'[3] The same Hebrew word is translated in Jeremiah 23.18, 22, by 'council' —'For who hath stood in the council of the Lord, that he should perceive and hear his word? who hath marked my word, and heard it? . . . I sent not these prophets, yet they ran: I spake not unto them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my council, then they had caused my people to hear my words. . . . ' One more example must suffice—in Job: 'Hast thou heard the secret counsel [the same Hebrew word] of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?'[4] Here then is a familiar Old Testament idea, which Jesus and His disciples must have known from the Synagogue. This provides by itself an adequate answer to those who deny the saying to our Lord because of the word 'mystery'. Moreover, there was a perfectly good Aramaic word to hand for Jesus to use—the word *raz*, which is used in Daniel 2 (translated 'secret') and which the LXX renders by μυστήριον.[5] But we must also notice that the same idea occurs elsewhere in the sayings of Jesus, as R. Newton Flew has pointed out.[1] The obvious reference is Matt. 11.25 = Luke 10.21. To run off on a wild goose chase after the influence of the mystery religions to explain something so familiar in the Bible is fantastic. It occurs again and again in the Old Testament and the New Testament alike. God's thoughts and ways are not men's.[2] Therefore they are not obvious to human wisdom, though God may reveal them to the upright, to those who fear Him, to the man who is of a contrite and humble spirit. Because of its sinfulness, even the people of God who should know God's ways, are blind to them very often.[3] But to an Amos the Lord reveals His intentions, or to a Jeremiah; and an Habakkuk takes his stand upon his watch-tower to hear what the Lord will say to him. The inn-keeper at Bethlehem does not know God's secret, but to the shepherds it is revealed. The thief on the cross knows the secret that is concealed from the High Priests. Here is nothing imported from heathenism, but one of the threads that run through all the Scriptures![4]

---

[1] *The Gospel of Mark* (1937), pp. 78 f. [2] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 48.

[3] In his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (1904), pp. 234-240.

[4] op. cit., pp. 13 f.

---

[1] Amos 3.7.

[2] Ps. 25.14.

[3] Prov. 3.32.

[4] Job 15.8.

[5] Cf. E. W. Heaton, *His Servants the Prophets* (1949), pp. 29, 116. Μυστήριον is not used in the LXX to translate any Hebrew word in the canonical scriptures of the O.T., but it is used eight times in the LXX in Dan. 2 to translate the Aramaic *raz* (R.V. 'secret'). In the other place where *raz* occurs (Dan. 4.6; R.V. 4.9) the translation of Theodotion has μυστήριον, but the LXX omits the verse. The LXX also has μυστήριον some dozen times in the Apocryphal books: of a king's secret plan (Tob. 12.7, 11, Jud. 2.2), of a friend's secret which it is shameful to divulge (Ecclus. 22.22, 27.16, etc.), of a military secret (2 Macc. 13.21), and of God's mysteries (Wisd. 2.22; in 14.15, 23 the word is used of heathen religious practices in association with 'solemn rites', a use clearly reflecting the pagan use of the word). It is interesting that the other Greek versions sometimes render a Hebrew word by μυστήριον: e.g. Symm. and Theod. both use it for *ṣodh* in Job 15.8 and Theod. uses it for *ṣodh* in Ps. 25.14. It seems as if the earlier translators purposely avoided the word on account of its pagan religious associations, but that after it had passed into common usage in a neutral sense the later trans-

What then is the content of the mystery here in Mark 4.11? It is not 'Erkenntnisse irgendwelcher Art über die kommende Königsherrschaft Gottes . . . sondern — wie der Singular zeigt — eine Erkenntnis: das Wissen um ihren gegenwärtigen Anbruch.'[5] It is the secret that the kingdom has come in the person and words and works of Jesus. It is a secret, because God has chosen that way. God, who could have revealed Himself in the great and strong wind or in the earthquake or the fire, actually chose to use the still small voice! The incarnate Word was not obvious. Only faith could recognise the Son of

---

lators came to use it more freely. Perhaps this is behind the curious fact that, while in the LXX *μυστήριον* is not used in Amos 3.7, it is used when that verse is quoted in Rev. 10.7. The word came to be used in Rabbinic writings as a loan-word (מִסְטֵירִין or מִסְתֵּירִין): for examples see Strack and Billerbeck, I.659 f., A. Schlatter, op. cit., pp. 429 f. For the occurrence of *μυστήριον* in an *agraphon* preserved by Clement of Alexandria (printed in Huck, 1949, English ed., p. 72) see Torrance, op. cit., p. 300.

[1] op. cit., pp. 62 ff.

[2] Isa. 55.8 f.

[3] Isa. 29.13 f., 42.19.

[4] Isa. 53.1 ff. is interesting in this connexion.

[5] Jeremias, op. cit., p. 8. Matthew and Luke, however, use the plural. Was Matt. thinking of the 'new law'?—the Rabbis used the loan-word מִסְטֵירִין of the Law. Should we say that the plural in Matt. and Luke gives a slightly moralistic or intellectualistic flavour and is not so clearly Christological as Mark's singular?

God. Only faith could see that the new order of God had broken in, the last days come. The secret of the kingdom of God is the secret of the person of Jesus.

Jesus says that the secret of the kingdom of God has been given (δέδοται) to the disciples. Jeremias is no doubt right in regarding the passive here as a circumlocution for the name of God.[1] The real subject is God, and we may render: 'Unto you God has given . . . '. The secret of the kingdom of God, i.e. the secret of the person of Jesus, is not something, which men discover by their own insight or cleverness: it can only be known by God's revelation. 'I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord or come to Him', says Luther. Compare Matt. 16.17, John 1.13, 3.3, 1 Cor. 12.3, and the significant placing of Mark 7.31 ff. and 8.22 ff. in relation to St. Peter's Confession.[2]

Contrasted with the disciples, to whom God has given the secret of the kingdom of God, are 'them that are without'.[3] Jeremias thinks that the sharpness of this contrast suggests that the saying belongs to the time after Peter's confession.[4] As this expression has met with disapproval—'not proper to the rest of the Synoptic record' (C. H. Dodd)—we had better look at it with some care. First—against those who would see the influence of the pagan mystery cults here—as far as I know, nobody has yet produced any evidence of the expression being used to denote those who have not been initiated into a sacred mystery. There were several regular words for that (ἀμύητος, ἀτέλεστος, ἀβάκχευτος, βέβηλος); but neither the new Liddell and Scott, nor Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary nor Walter Bauer's

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 8, note 5d. Cf. his *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 2nd ed. (1949), p. 91, point 13.

[2] Whether with Lohmeyer (ad loc.) we should see a distinction in meaning between Mark's 'is given' and Matt. and Luke's 'it is given to know' ('Mk sagt mehr, so gewiss der Besitz mehr ist als die Erkenntnis') is not certain. On the one hand 'know' has a strong sense in the Bible, something more than merely intellectual knowledge; on the other hand, the Hebrew verb *nathan* can mean something very like 'reveal' (see Brown, Driver and Briggs, Lexicon, meanings *r* and *w*) and this might be reflected in the use of 'give' here. But anyway what is meant here is a knowledge that amounts to what might be called 'possession', a real sharing in the thing known. Elsewhere Jesus speaks of God giving the kingdom itself (Luke 12.32) and the sense here is similar. The revelation of the mystery to the disciples means that they are made partakers in the kingdom, in Christ Himself, and also that it is entrusted to them to announce to others (cf. 1 Cor. 4.1).

[3] ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω; Matt. has simply ἐκείνοις and then αὐτοῖς; Luke has τοῖς λοιποῖς.

[4] Op. cit. p.10.

Dictionary gives any instance of οἱ ἔξω meaning 'the uninitiated'. So it is a mistake to leap to the conclusion that here is another clear proof of the influence of the mystery religions! On the other hand, it is perfectly true that the expression is quite a common one in classical Greek. So Thucydides says that the Spartans were in constant apprehension when the Helots were deserting, lest those Helots who remained in the Peloponnese might, 'relying on those outside' (τοῖς ἔξω πίσυνοι), take advantage of the situation to renew their old attempts at rebellion.[1] Elsewhere he uses οἱ φίλοι τῶν ἔξω, meaning 'the friends of the exiles'.[2] In Demosthenes there is an interesting phrase, τῶν ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος ὄντων, i.e. 'persons not concerned in the matter'.[3] In Mark 4.11 the expression might mean 'those outside the house' (in which the disciples are at the moment). 'The house' occurs a number of times in Mark (2.1, 3.20, 7.17, 9.28, 33, 10.10) and is the scene of private conversation between Jesus and His disciples. Jesus may have used the Aramaic equivalent with both the literal sense, 'those outside the house', and also the derived sense, 'those outside the number of the disciples' in mind. It is true that the expression only occurs here in the Gospels and that it occurs a number of times in Paul (1 Cor. 5.12, 1 Thess. 4.12, Col. 4.5; cf. 1 Tim. 3.7); but there is no need to conclude that here it must be due to Pauline influence. There is a Hebrew adjective *ḥîtson*, which means 'outside'. It is used in the O.T. in Ezek. 10.5, Neh. 11.16, 1 Chron. 26.29. These three references indicate the same hovering between a literal and a metaphorical use as we have just seen in the case of the Greek expression. The same Hebrew word probably lies behind the Greek τοῖς ἐκτός in the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus, which according to J. Behm[4] denotes the laity as opposed to the scribes, according to Lohmeyer[5] the gentiles and/or unbelieving Jews. In the later Rabbinic writings *ḥîtson* is used to denote heretics, those who care nothing for the Halaka of the Scribes.[6] It would seem that Jewish usage is adequate to explain both Jesus' and Paul's use of the expression, and we conclude that 'unto them that are without' is no evidence against the authenticity of the saying.

[1] V.xiv.3.
[2] IV.lxvi.2.
[3] 528.22.
[4] TWzNT. II.572.
[5] op. cit., p. 83.
[6] Reff. in Strack and Billerbeck, II, p. 7.

For these people who are without, says Jesus, ἐν παραβολαῖς[1] τὰ πάντα γίνεται (R.V.: 'all things are done in parables'). This is difficult Greek. It has usually been taken to mean: 'I teach in parables', and if we take vv. 11 f. closely with its context, that is indeed its obvious meaning. So Matthew has 'but to them it is not given . . . therefore *speak* I to them in parables'. But the Mark and Luke forms of this part of the saying could have a different meaning if we take the saying as an independent logion and disregard its context. So Jeremias argues that παραβολή should not be translated 'parable', but 'riddle' here, that γίνεται (R.V.: 'are done') is here the equivalent of ἔστιν

---

[1] The word παραβολή occurs 47 times in the LXX. Of these 47 occurrences 33 are in the canonical books of the O.T. and 14 in the Apocrypha (12 in Ecclus.). In 28 out of the 33 occurrences in the O.T. it represents the Hebrew *mashal*. In the other 5 it is twice a mistake for the similar root which means 'rule', once it represents the verb of the same root as *māshāl* ('parable'), once it represents the Hebrew word *holeloth* (Eccles. 1.17, R.V. 'madness'), while once it is in an extra phrase which is not in the Hebrew. In addition παραβολή is sometimes used in the other Greek versions to render *mashal* where the LXX uses a different word (e.g. in Prov. 1.1, where LXX has παροιμία, and Isa. 14.4, where LXX has θρῆνος). So it is clear that behind παραβολή in the Gospels there stands *mashal* (with its Aramaic equivalent).

The noun *mashal* occurs 39 times in the O.T. In 28 of these occurrences, as we have seen, it is represented by παραβολή in the LXX. In the remaining 11 it is represented by a number of Greek words: by προοίμιον twice, παρανομία once, δουλεία once, ἀφανισμός twice, θρῆνος once, παροιμία once, ἴσα + dative once, παιδεία once (here Codex Alex. has παροιμία), and in the remaining instance the phrase in which it occurs in the Hebrew is omitted by the Greek. The word παροιμία only once represents *mashal* in the O.T., but as this is in Prov. 1.1, it was used as the title of the book, which in Hebrew is called *M^{e}shalim*. In the Apocrypha it occurs five times (in Ecclus.) and in the other Greek versions it sometimes stands for *mashal*, where LXX has παραβολή. The meaning of παραβολή in the Synoptics and of παροιμία in John is determined by the Hebrew *mashal* and its Aramaic equivalent and *not* by the significance the words have in pagan Greek.

For the various meanings of *mashal* see T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 60 ff. and also B. T. D. Smith, op. cit. The term covers a wide range including ethical maxims, short sentences of popular wisdom, proverbs generally, by-word, taunt-song, oracle, comparison, allegory, fable, parable. It is instructive to notice what other words are specially associated with *mashal* in the O.T. One particularly important such word is *ḥidah*, which means 'riddle', 'dark saying', something put indirectly and requiring interpretation, 'allegory' (Ezek. 17.2), 'perplexing question'. It occurs 17 times in the O.T. and is represented in the LXX 10 times by πρόβλημα, 5 times by αἴνιγμα, and once each by διήγημα and διήγησις. Particularly interesting from our point of view are the following passages: Ezek. 17.2: 'Son of man, put forth a riddle (*ḥidah*, διήγημα in LXX, αἴνιγμα in Symm.), and speak a parable unto the house of Israel.' Ps. 78.2: 'I will open my mouth in a parable (*mashal*, παραβολή); I will utter dark sayings (*ḥidah*, πρόβλημα) of old' (cf. Ps. 49.4). Prov 1.6: 'To understand a proverb (*mashal*, παραβολή) and a figure (*m^{e}liẓah*, σκοτεινὸς λόγος); the words of the wise, and their dark sayings (*ḥidah*, αἴνιγμα).' Cf. also Ezek. 20.49 (Hebrew 21.5). Perhaps most interesting of all for us is Num. 12.8, where God says with reference to Moses: 'With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches. . . .' Here *mashal* is not used; but ('are'), and that *ἐν παραβολαῖς* is equivalent to an adjective.[1] He renders: 'To you God has given the secret of the kingdom of God; but to them that are without everything has the nature of a riddle (ist alles rätselvoll).' That *παραβολή can* have this meaning, and *γίνεται* stand for *ἐστιν*, and *ἐν* + a noun be equivalent to an adjective, there is no doubt. The fact that we thus get a clear parallelism between the two parts of v. 11—for the disciples the secret is revealed, for those outside everything is veiled—encourages us to accept this as the *original* meaning of the saying. But before we attempt to expound its significance, we must look at v. 12. We see no reason for denying the authenticity of v. 11.

V. 12 is dependent on the second member of the antithesis in the preceding verse and we should punctuate with a comma at the end of v. 11 (with Nestle, Huck, etc.), not a colon as in the R.V. 'But for those that are without all things have the nature of a riddle, in order that seeing they may see,[2] and not

---

b^{e}*ḥidoth* (*δι' αἰνιγμάτων*) is contrasted with *mar'eh* (*ἐν εἴδει*). Paul presumably had this sentence in mind when he wrote 1 Cor. 13.12: *βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.* His *δι' ἐσόπτρου* reflects the Rabbinic explanation of *mar'eh* as meaning 'in a mirror' (cf. the interesting article in TWzNT, I, pp. 177 ff.).

From the above it would seem that *mashal* and *ḥidah* were felt to have much the same meaning and that *bim*^{e}*shalim* and *b*^{e}*ḥidoth* could be used indifferently to denote the indirectness of revelation and similarly *ἐν παραβολαῖς, δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἐν αἰνίγματι.* It also becomes clear that there is a close connexion between *ṣodh-raz-μυστήριον* on the one hand and *mashal-ḥidah-παραβολή-παροιμία-αἴνιγμα*. Both groups of words are drawn into use to refer to divine plans and activity which cannot be known by men except by God's revelation and which can only be described in human language *indirectly*. *Ṣodh-raz-μυστήριον* concentrates attention more on the *content* that is secret; the other group of words concentrates attention rather on the form or manner in which the secret is revealed. Perhaps it should be pointed out here that the secret still partakes of the nature of a secret even for those to whom it has been given. It does not become something simple and self-evident. The contrast between *τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται* and *ἐν παραβολαῖς* here is that between having, and not having, the clue to the secret, but it does not mean that those to whom the secret has been given are henceforth beyond the area of *παραβολαί*, i.e. beyond the stage of indirect knowledge. The Fourth Evangelist similarly has a contrast between *ἐν παροιμίαις* and *παρρησίᾳ* (16.25-29); but whatever he does mean, it is certainly not that henceforth the apostolic Church's knowledge is altogether free from the indirectness of revelation. (Does Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, 2.579 f., say too much?) That final release from indirectness does not take place before the Parousia. To imagine that it does is a dangerous *Schwärmerei*. Meantime even the Church, though it sees in a mirror (*δι' ἐσόπτρου*), i.e. like Moses in a relatively direct manner as compared with others (cf. G. Kittel in TWzNT, I.177 ff.), is nevertheless still only able to see now *ἐν αἰνίγματι* and not yet *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον* (1 Cor. 13.12).

[1] Op. cit., pp. 8 f.

[2] Is the quotation of the reference to seeing as well as of that to hearing perhaps a slight support to the view that the saying originally referred to the Ministry as a whole and not just to the teaching?

perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand.[1] . . .' Scholars have sought in various ways to remove the stumbling-block of the ἵνα ('in order that'); but we shall be well advised to avoid the temptation to try to weaken the final clause into a consecutive, causal or relative clause. It is true that ἵνα in the N.T. is sometimes equivalent to ὥστε ('so that')—John 9.2 is a good example—and that at least in Rev. 22.14 it has the sense of ὅτι ('because').[2] It is also true that in Aramaic the same word can serve both as a relative pronoun and a final conjunction and that in translation this could easily lead to mistakes.[3] But, as Stauffer points out in his extremely valuable article on ἵνα in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch*,[4] Mark. 4.11 f. and similar statements 'lose through this weakening interpretation their offence, but also for that very reason their wisdom. They reveal their ultimate theological seriousness only when they are understood as final in the strictest sense. The N.T. has a special preference for sentences with ἵνα. But this multiplication has its decisive cause not in the linguistic weakening and broadening of the conjunction ἵνα . . . much rather in the teleological understanding of God's ways and of the destiny of man which in the N.T. is come to fulfilment.' Both Stauffer and Bauer are quite convinced that the ἵνα here is to be taken as final. Its significance is to declare that the veiledness of God's action in Jesus, so far as those that are without are concerned, is not a matter of blind chance but lies within the purpose of God. That this brings us into deep waters is not to be denied; but it is questionable in the extreme whether our difficulties are really any less, if we seek to safeguard the conception of man's freewill by weakening the ἵνα into a ὥστε, a ὅτι, or a οἵ. We are very liable to discover that we have thought ourselves out of a determination by the divine will only to find ourselves imprisoned by other much more sinister conditioning forces—heredity, environment, and so on. So we doubt very much whether those who go all out to get rid of the scriptural ἵνα ever really arrive at a more satisfying view of man's freedom. The scriptural teleological thinking, even in its most extreme form, as for instance in Exodus 9.16, is, we suspect, likely to prove in the end more favourable to human freedom that any alternative that is likely to offer itself! At any rate, as far as this passage is concerned, it should be pointed out, that, even when one has got rid of the final clause, one is still up against the δέδοται in v. 11 with its implication of a corresponding οὐ δέδοται (cf. Matt. parallel). Moreover the teleological thinking of the Bible contains a progression from one τέλος to another, i.e. through a succession of intermediate goals on to the final goal, the 'Endziel Gottes'. So, as Torrance points out,[1] the ἵνα in Mark 4.12 has to be seen in the light of the twofold ἵνα in 4.22, while in Rom. 11 the final clauses pile themselves up until at last in verse 32 the divine *Endziel* comes into view—'in order that He might have mercy upon all'. If Jeremias is right in taking μήποτε as equivalent to 'in case they may', then we already have a glimpse of this *Endziel Gottes* in the remaining clause of of v. 12. The μήποτε in the LXX of Isa. 6.10, rendering the Hebrew *pen* certainly means 'in order that . . . not'; but behind μήποτε here in Mark 4.12 there is presumably an Aramaic *dil*^{e}*ma*, which could mean either 'in order that . . . not' or ' in case' (*ob nicht vielleicht*). The Rabbinic exegesis of Isa. 6.10 took the *dil*^{e}*ma* of the Targum of Isa. 6.10 in the latter sense—

---

[1] Isa. 6.9 f. in full or in part is quoted not only here and in the Matt. and Luke parallels but also in John 12.40 and Acts 28.26 f. There are differences between the Hebrew and the LXX. While the Hebrew has 'Make the heart of this people fat, and make . . . , and shut . . . ', the LXX has made the people the subject of these verbs. Matt. 13.14 f. reproduces the LXX text. It will be seen that the LXX thus makes the passage somewhat less offensive. The other difference is that the last verb in the Hebrew in v. 10 has the people for its subject —'and be healed', but the LXX has 'and I should heal them'. In Acts also the LXX is the text quoted. In John 12.40 the ending is as in the LXX, but the first part of the quotation is free: 'He hath blinded their eyes and he hardened their heart. . . . ' This makes the passage more offensive by making God the subject of these verbs. Cf. Deut. 29.4, Ps. 69.22 f., Isa. 29.10, Rom. 11.8-10. There are further interesting differences between the Synoptics here. Matt. reproduces Mark 4.12 in an abbreviated and modified form in 13.13, and then quotes the Isa. passage in full in the two following verses. The main difference between Mark 4.12 and Matt. 13.13 is that Matthew replaces Mark's ἵνα by ὅτι, thus making the people's spiritual blindness the reason for Jesus' teaching in parables. It is not clear whether Matthew means that Jesus' intention in teaching in parables was to remove the people's ignorance by using a form of teaching they would understand or, as R. H. Lightfoot argues, to punish their ignorance by using a form of teaching they would not understand. Luke keeps the Marcan ἵνα but greatly abbreviates the quotation. One other point may be mentioned here. Mark has at the end of the quotation neither the LXX 'and I should heal' (or 'I shall heal them') nor the Hebrew 'and be healed', but 'and it should be forgiven them'. The interesting thing about this is that it agrees with the Targum (cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 77).

[2] Though it is just possible to take it in a final sense in Rev. 22.14. See Pernot, op. cit. and Windisch, op. cit. Lohmeyer renders ἵνα in Mark 4.12 by '*weil*' (pp. 83 f.).

[3] See T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 78; M. Black, op. cit., pp. 153 ff.

[4] III.324 ff.

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 303.

'in case'. It seems probable that our Lord would follow the exegesis of His time, and that therefore the clause here in Mark 4.12 should be rendered: 'in case they may repent and God forgive them'.[1]

Before we try to expound a little more fully the significance of vv. 11 f., first as an independent saying and secondly in its present context in the parables section, we must face the question, 'Is v. 12 authentic—i.e. does it really come from the lips of Jesus?' It would conceivably be possible, while admitting the authenticity of v. 11, to argue that v. 12 is the addition of Mark or the early Church after the fashion of Matthew's 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet' (4.14, cf. 1.22, 2.15, 23, etc.). We know the early Church's interest in O.T. 'testimonies'. It was by no means confined to Matthew. But, if v. 12 were such an addition, it would almost certainly (to judge from Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* under *ἵνα*) have contained some such formula as 'that the scripture might be fulfilled' or 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken . . .'. It is noticeable that in the Matthew parallel vv. 14 f. are added on top of v. 13b. That Jesus should ponder on this chapter of Isaiah is in itself highly probable. It is noticeable that references to hearing and seeing are often on His lips. The main reason for wanting to deny the authenticity of this verse is, of course, the *ἵνα*. Some of those who are anxious to be rid of the stumbling-block prefer to attribute the verse to the early Church seeking to account for the unbelief of Israel rather than to attempt to explain away its final sense. But we have seen how deeply biblical the final clause is, being rooted in the teleological way of thinking. That this way of thinking was shared by Jesus is manifest—for instance, in the passages predicting the passion (Mark 8.31 ff., 9.31, 10.32 ff.) the authenticity of which would seem to be guaranteed by the presence of the inaccurate 'after three days'.[2] In the absence of any compelling evidence against the authenticity of v. 12 we regard it as a genuine part of Jesus' saying.

What then is the significance of the saying recorded in Mark 4.11 f.—first as an independent logion not specially connected with the parables? The clue is in the 'Messianic secret'—not in Wrede's sense of a theory *read into* the material by Mark, but in the sense of something *proper to* the material, an integral characteristic of God's act in Jesus Christ. It is one of the great merits of Schniewind's commentary on St. Mark that he recognises the Messianic secret in this sense as the key to the interpretation of the Gospel. The kingdom of God, i.e. 'God's saving intervention among men' (to use Torrance's phrase), God's action in the person, words and works of Jesus, is a secret or mystery, not in the sense of something that must not be divulged to the uninitiated, but in the sense of something that can only be recognised by faith, and that a God-given faith (δέδοται). In the eyes of the world what could be less kingly than this Jesus, who is rejected by the religious leaders of His people and, powerless in the hands of His enemies, dies under the curse of the Law,[1] abandoned by His followers, abandoned by God? Here was a paradoxical Messiah indeed. Only a God-given faith can penetrate so deep an incognito of weakness and weariness, poverty, temptation, pain and humiliation, and recognise the Messiah of Israel, the Son of God. There are those to whom God has given the secret. For the rest it remains a closed secret. They are not even conscious that they are in the presence of a mystery; for to them it all seems clear enough—here is an impostor deservedly unmasked. They hear the same words of Jesus as those who believe, see the same works, the same person; but they know Him *only* 'after the flesh'.

---

[1] Op. cit, p. 9. Cf. Manson, op. cit., pp. 78 f.

[2] A prophecy after the event would have been more exact—'on the third day' as in Matt. and Luke and some MSS. of Mark.

But this veiledness of the Messiah is *within* God's purpose. By means of it a division is made among men, a separation of belief and unbelief. According as men respond to God's saving intervention in Christ in its veiledness, so they are judged. The blindness and wilfulness of those who reject the Messiah in His incognito are made manifest, their sin is shown up in its real nature. We may compare the Johannine words: 'For judgment came I into this world, that they which see not may see; and that they which see may become blind'[2]—words which might well be a Johannine meditation upon our saying. They indicate vividly the twofold effect of Jesus' mission. But notice that here too there is a ἵνα. The coming of the Son of God into the world involves a judgment, a judgment which is indeed part of

---

[1] Deut. 21.23. [2] John 9.39.

God's purpose, but it is not His ultimate purpose. His final purpose or 'Endziel' is not judgment but salvation. Compare John 3.16 ff. As we saw above, the last words of Mark 4.12 are probably to be interpreted as giving a glimpse at God's ultimate goal.

To some extent, then, the 'Why?' of the Messianic secret is made apparent in v. 12a; it has for its purpose this division of men and the revealing of the real sinfulness of men both inside and outside Israel. But the more ultimate answer to the question 'Why?' is hinted at, we think, in v. 12b and expressed clearly in such passages as John 3.17. The Messianic secret has for its purpose the salvation of men. Can we go further than this? Can we discern at all *how* this veiledness of God's intervention in Christ leads to men's salvation and why this way should be necessary? We must say at once that we cannot hope to get to the bottom of God's counsels even in eternity, much less in this life—for 'unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out'. We have first simply to acknowledge that it happened so, that this is as a matter of fact the way God worked (and still works in the Word and Sacraments), and this was and is according to His will. But having done this we may try very humbly to discern some things which, as far as we can see, are made possible by this veiledness and indirectness of God's self-revelation—although we must be careful to avoid the temptation to seize upon any one thing that we discover and declare that it is *the* reason, as though we could exhaust God's reasons.

Here it seems to the present writer that Torrance's article in this Journal in September 1950 (particularly pp. 303-306 and 312 f.) is of special value. He takes this saying in close connexion with the parables, but what he says is also applicable in the wider sense in which we think the saying was originally meant. Torrance speaks of Christ 'confronting men with Himself, the Word, in such a way that men can choose Him in love and yet not be overwhelmed by His divine majesty. . . . Jesus consistently avoids giving a compelling manifestation of Himself for that would leave no room for faith and decision and men would be fixed in their sin by the unveiled divine majesty. . . . In the parable [and, we may add, in the whole veiledness of the Incarnation and of the ministry of Word and Sacraments], so to speak, the Kingdom of God comes into the midst and throws a man into the crisis of decision, and yet by its veiled form the Word of the Kingdom holds man at arm's length away in order to give him room and time for personal decision. . . .' In other words, one purpose of the Messianic secret was and is to give men room to make a personal decision, apart from which there could be no faith, except that kind that the devils have (James 2.19). The removal of the veiledness must, it seems, have the effect of fixing men in the state in which they are, whether of faith or unbelief. Hence the finality of the Parousia. In His earthly life Jesus avoided such open and direct revelation. That is the explanation of the in some ways surprising reticence of the Resurrection appearances. Jesus did not appear after the Resurrection to anyone except His friends who already in some measure believed on Him. To have appeared to Caiaphas or Pilate would have meant taking away from him for ever the possibility of *faith*. Moreover, even to those who did already believe Jesus' appearances were marked by a certain reticence.

When v. 12b speaks of men 'turning again', it is hinting, we would suggest, at this purpose of the Messianic secret about which we have been speaking. Turning again or repentance is the work of faith. It cannot take place, unless there is freedom from external compulsion by the unveiled divine majesty (but not from the inward compulsion of the divine giving (δέδοται).[1]

Can we discern any other reason for the veiledness of revelation? We think we can. So far we have been thinking about the (from our point of view) subjective significance of the Messianic secret. But is there not also an objective significance? Is not the hiddenness of the Messiah part of the burden which He bore on our behalf, part of the curse that was laid on Him, part of the 'Passus' of the Apostles' Creed, which, as Barth pointed out in *Credo*,[2] covers the whole of His life on earth, not merely the sufferings connected with His death? As a result of our sin our whole human existence has become questionable and problematic. Over against the very statement that we are human, created in the image of God, sin has written a threatening mark of interrogation. Before God we have become wholly questionable. It is also true that we have become questionable and problematic to one another. In the history of the people of God this questionableness becomes vividly apparent, for instance in the 'I' of the Psalms, whose days are passed away in God's wrath and who is the object of the reproaches and mockery of his fellows. In the Gospels we see Jesus entering into this twofold questionableness and bearing it for us. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' He cries; and compare Mark 15.29-32 with Ps. 42—'As with a sword in my bones, mine adversaries reproach me[1]; while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God?' Having 'no form nor comeliness', 'no beauty that we should desire him', 'despised, and rejected of men, a man of sorrows', His back given to the smiters, His face undefended against 'shame and spitting', condemned as a blasphemer, refusing the temptation to come down from the cross and so justify Himself before men, but rather waiting for God at last to plead His cause and justify Him—so He entered into the depths of our human questionableness and loneliness. All this was involved in bearing our sins.

---

[1] In what has been said above about men having freedom to make a personal decision there is no intention of denying that man cannot of himself believe. Of himself fallen man is only free for unbelief. But it is also true that there is no decision that a man ever makes that is so truly and fully his own free personal decision as that which he makes in the freedom which the Holy Spirit works in him!

[2] Engl. trans., pp. 73 ff. Barth refers to *Heidelberg Catechism*, Quest. 37, which is most suggestive.

There is a further point that must be mentioned here. The Messianic Secret did not come to an end with the Resurrection or the Ascension. It is continued in the life of the Church. Jesus is indeed exalted now, but His Church is still 'under the cross', still open to His reproach, still involved in that hiddenness and veiledness, called to share in the Messianic secret of its Lord. That means that the Church's knowledge is still 'in part', it does not yet know as it is known; it still sees only *ἐν αἰνίγματι*. It means also that the Church's proclamation of the Gospel is *ἐν παραβολαῖς*. In Word and Sacraments the secret is maintained. Christ's presence in His Word and Sacraments is a veiled and indirect presence, He is not present in unveiled majesty. He speaks through the inadequate words of sinful men, of Scripture and of the preacher, and gives Himself to us by means of water and bread and wine. The Church cannot prove the truth of its message; it can only believe and wait and bear witness. Its testimony in the eyes of the world is sheer folly. Only those, to whom God has given the mystery of the kingdom of God, perceive as well as see and understand as well as hear. So the Church is called to be humbled now with the Gospel in its veiledness, sharing in the humiliation of Christ's earthly life, in order that hereafter it may share in His glory.[1] It is called to 'go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach'.[2]

---

[1] LXX: *ὠνείδισαν*. The words *ὄνειδος*, *ὀνειδίζω*, *ὀνειδισμός*, will repay study in this connexion. See J. Schneider in TWzNT, V. 238-242.

If this is true, we are bound to ask whether the Church has given adequate attention to the task of trying to understand its implications and to live them out. Is it not true that the life of all our denominations is marked by the attempt (in one form or another) to deny the eschatological 'not yet' and to escape from Christ's reproach and from sharing in the Messianic hiddenness? Reformation according to the Word of God must surely include the serious effort to understand the significance of the Messianic secret, and to submit our Church life and our ways of ecclesiastical thinking to its criticism. Are we rather apt to attribute to the present historically-conditioned sinful life of the Church, and, indeed, of our own particular denomination, a finality which does not belong to it, to identify our denomination with the kingdom of God? That is to forget eschatology and to indulge in an altogether bogus *παρρησία*. Do we sometimes seem to be going back on Jesus' free acceptance of the conditions of the Messianic secret? He refused to demonstrate His truth by a leap from the Temple pinnacle or by acceding to the request for a sign or by coming down from the cross, and the Church is called to accept the conditions He accepted. But do we not get impatient with these conditions and imagine that we can prove the truth of our Gospel by appealing to the numerical size of our denomination and the impressiveness of its organisation, and so on? When, for instance, the ecclesiastical press scolds the secular press for not giving as much publicity to a Christian youth conference as to a Communist one, we are not sure that all is well. It is not always easy for us to distinguish between placarding the scandal of the cross and appealing to the impressiveness of our achievements. Again, are some of us apt to mistake the quite secular appeal of the Church, its aesthetic, romantic, archaeological, and 'social' impressiveness, for the 'work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope'? Here we can only raise the question of the implications of the Messianic secret for the present life of the Church; but we are certain that it is a very relevant question.

---

[1] Rom. 8.17.

[2] Heb. 13.13.

Finally, we must look at the relevance of Mark 4.11 f. to the parables. We have seen that there is reason to think that originally the significance of these words of Jesus was wider and that they referred to His whole ministry, His person, words and works as a whole. But Mark has set them in his parable chapter. Was that simply a misunderstanding on his part? If it were not for the rest of his Gospel, one might be inclined to regard this as a misunderstanding and to think that Mark by narrowing the reference of this logion to the teaching had failed to give it its due importance. But in view of the rest of his Gospel we can hardly say this; for he most of all the Evangelists has stressed the Messianic secret and so by the whole texture of his narrative made up for his narrowing of the reference of this saying. Moreover, he allows the wider meaning to peer through even in this chapter.

And it is certainly true that the saying does refer to the parables—though not only to them. The parabolic teaching is an excellent example of the wider veiledness, as Torrance brings out so well in the article already referred to. And so by bringing the saying into relation with the parables Mark has actually thrown light upon the Messianic secret.

When the saying is taken in close connexion with its immediate context, the words τὰ πάντα γίνεται must refer to the *teaching* of Jesus—compare the Matthew parallel, 'Therefore speak I to them . . . ', while ἐν παραβολαῖς will refer not only to what *we* tend to mean exclusively by 'parable' but also to such sayings as 4.22, 7.15 (7.17 shows that Mark regards this as a parable), and indeed to *indirect* teaching generally. But for the rest we refer the reader back to Professor Torrance's excellent treatment of this saying in relation to the parabolic teaching.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christian Challenge to Philosophy. By W. H. V. Reade. S.P.C.K pp. xiii + 195. 13s. 6d.

Mr Cyril Bailey has edited, with a short memoir, this book which his friend W. H. V. Reade wrote between his retirement in 1937 and his death in 1943. Reade, who spent most of his working life as philosophy tutor at Keble College, is best known outside Oxford as a writer on Dante. He also wrote on the problems of Church and State and on logic.

Reade here maintains that there is strictly no such thing as Christian philosophy; nor, incidentally, Christian art, culture or civilisation. He holds that the Christian can and should meet all the legitimate claims of natural reason and science on their own ground without surrendering any essential of the Christian revelation. These essentials are not to be found in anything that natural reason or science can tell us, though they are compatible with natural reason and science, since the whole universe is God's creation. Thus Reade says that the task St. Thomas Aquinas set himself was not to produce *a* Christian philosophy or *the* Christian philosophy, but to show, in contradiction of the Averroists, that science and reason as exemplified in Aristotle are compatible with revelation. There is ultimately only one truth, but we limited human creatures arrive at different parts of it by different routes. This argument does not make philosophy superfluous for the Christian but makes it a tool; and presumably gives him a choice of tools according to his purpose. Reade deals with his subject in historical order, from the Greeks to the present day, but it will probably be a help to the reader to begin with his last chapter where he sets out what he considers the essentials of Christian faith.

Greek philosophy professed to provide a way of life which the enlightened and reasoning man could follow, when the old pagan religions had become impossible for him. In this Plato, Zeno, Epicurus and all their followers were at one. But the philosophers had no message except for the educated few and even for them it was curiously empty. Greek philosophy was clear enough on the badness of the bad life, but had no way of showing the good which should constitute the good life. Christian teaching alone could fill the gap left by it. '. . . for Christians, the supreme fact in the universe is not a law, nor any stupendous concatenation of laws, but a Person; and the knowledge of personality (even at its humblest level by persons cannot be obtained by the methods upon which the progress of science depends. The clue to such knowledge of God as is possible for man is not absorption of the particular into the universal, but discovery of the individual, . . . ' (p. 173). For the Platonist (and Aristotle here must be counted a Platonist) there is no true knowledge except of the universal. All events, the process of history, the actual intercourse of persons belong to the realm of mere opinion; they hover between being and not-being.

Reade is undoubtedly right in pointing to this blank spot in Greek thought, and probably in all religious thought, except Jewish and Christian. He is also right in saying that when Christians took over theology, rational discourse about God, from the Platonists they radically transformed it. He may go too far in saying that there can not be a Christian Platonist, for the two are incompatible. It would make things awkward for St. Augustine, St. Anselm and others whose orthodoxy is, officially, beyond reproach. However that may be, his whole discussion of Greek philosophy is worth pondering.

Coming to modern times, Reade has no difficulty in showing that the Christian can take the discoveries of science in his stride and has nothing to fear from the new 'ideologies', which on the one side are Christian heresies, on the other counterfeits of the Greek view of philosophy as way of life. More important than this is his discussion at the end of the book of the variety and apparent inconsistency of the Christian witness, with which the critics of Christianity make so much play.

If Christian faith consisted in the first place in adherence to a logically ordered system of abstract concepts, like Euclidean geometry, any variety would be fatal; there would be no reply to the critic who pointed it out. But if Christian faith springs from acquaintance with a person and the abstract concepts come later, the case is different, specially when it involves a relation between the finite and the infinite. Plato and Xenophon were both acquainted with Socrates and have left quite different accounts of him; the two versions of his *Apology* are, formally, incompatible. Scholars used to suppose that Xenophon's more meagre picture must be 'the historical Socrates' and therefore Plato's must be fictitious, or at least that both could not be true. Surely they both reported as faithfully as they could, as much as they could. Even if Plato reported a bit more by putting words into Socrates' mouth which he never actually heard him speak, that may be a less distortion than failing to report intelligibly some things he did say. All this is in respect of one who was no more than merely human.

If there is one thing which stands out from the Gospel narratives it is that the disciples of Jesus were immensely surprised, puzzled and uncertain. Only gradually, on reflection were they able to piece things together. That is equally true of many sincere Christians in later times, perhaps of all. Those moderns who argue that if only Christians would scrap the traditional dogmatic formulae and adhere to the simple ethical teaching of the Gospels have partly grasped the limitations of abstract concepts but failed to do so completely. Reade says (p. 170) that if he had to choose between expounding the doctrine of the Trinity and providing a clear application of the Sermon on the Mount to the ordinary business of life, he would prefer the first as the easier alternative and less likely to arouse antagonism. The gravest and most destructive differences between Christians and those which provide the best arguments for their critics have been in their practice. Even there the question cannot be settled by pointing to the evil things that professed Christians have done. 'Idle and lascivious monks, worldly popes, unctuous psalm-singing impostors, there may have been in abundance, but not thus did the ideals of the cloister, of the papal supremacy, or of Cromwell's army, come into existenec and not thus can their peculiarities be explained' (p. 172). And of course the peculiarities are part of the faith and witness, and are not to be explained away or smoothed out by compromise.

This is a masterly book and a very witty, well written one too.

A. D. Ritchie

The Epistle to Diognetus: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes. By H. G. Meecham, D.D., Principal of Hartley Victoria College Manchester. Manchester University Press, 1949. pp. 165. 18s. net.

Among the somewhat sparse writings of the earliest Apologists, the anonymous little Epistle to Diognetus takes a prominent place, for its literary qualities no less than its noble and intense Christian thought and feeling. To his edition Dr Meecham has brought a sensitive appreciation and a thoroughness of scholarship which makes his work a model of its kind.

In its reasoned statement of the Christian faith as 'a revelation of unimaginable love', with its picture of Christians as 'the soul of the world', the Epistle to Diognetus is a tract for all time. The supreme merit of Dr Meecham's edition is that it is a work of Christian scholarship in the best sense: he has done more than edit the Epistle; he has contributed to a deeper appreciation of its permanent value.

The theologian will find most to interest him in Dr Meecham's admirable discussion of the Teaching of the Epistle, with its simple and unscholastic redemptive Christology, deeply influenced by the

Johannine writings (the occasional rhythmic style with its 'Hebraic' parallelism is also Johannine). But every important aspect of the theology of the Epistle comes under review, God, the Christian Community (at home everywhere on earth, yet nowhere save in Heaven), moral and religious values, Eschatology, and Christian and Jewish worship.

Literary and linguistic questions are fully discussed, the latter with meticulous care, and the Greek text (which faces the translation as in the Loeb classics) is furnished with a critical apparatus and copious notes. The author favours the earlier date (*c.* A.D. 150) and takes the view that the last two chapters are by a different author. Campbell Bonner's suggestion that they came out of a homily of Melito is not adopted; Dr Meecham is more sympathetic to Connolly's case for Hippolytean authorship. The recent theory of Dom Andriessen that the Epistle is addressed to the Emperor Hadrian under the pseudonym of Diognetus and is to be identified with the Apology of Quadratus is discussed in an appendix, but came to the author's notice too late for a more detailed examination.

One can understand the attraction this little Epistle must have held for one who stands in the tradition of the Wesleys, for there is a certain kinship in spirit. But no one can read this noble and cleansing utterance, so admirably expounded and edited, without sharing in the warmth and glow of the mind in which it took form and expression.

MATTHEW BLACK

John Cassian. A Study in Primitive Monasticism. By OWEN CHADWICK. Cambridge University Press. 15s.

THE life of John Cassian, extending from about 360 to 433, coincides with a critical and dark period in the history of Europe. It must have been eventful in its own way. His birthplace is unknown but a Christian and a (Latin) Classical education was available. After full review of the scanty evidence Mr Chadwick surprisingly decides for the Dobrudja in preference to Provence. At all events about 380 he entered a Greek Monastery at Bethlehem shortly before Jerome settled there. Soon he had leave of absence to visit the famed ascetics of the Egyptian desert, and with them he remained absorbing their wisdom, their spirituality. This period, decisive for his life's work, terminated abruptly, possibly on account of the Origenist-Anthropomorphic controversy; for about 400, like so many Origenists, he betook himself to Constantinople, and was ordained deacon by Chrysostom for whom he continued to entertain the deepest veneration. Involved presumably in Chrysostom's fall he next went to

Rome where he had the friendship of the future Pope Leo, the Great. Finally, driven from Rome perhaps by the oncoming Alaric, he settled for the rest of his life in Massilia in a monastic community which he founded, and there he became a figure second only to St. Augustine in the Latin Church. He was the leader of the Semi-pelagian party in South Gaul, the *Collator* of Prosper's controversial work. And it was to him that Pope Celestine referred the Nestorian dispute, hardly intelligible to a purely Western mind. Above all he interpreted Egyptian ascetic spirituality to the West, in the process purging it of its thaumaturgy and its disciplinary excesses, so preparing the way for Benedict who simply laid down the Rule whereby the Cassianic spiritual ideal might be realised as far as possible. Unhappily 'Cassian could not have written the Confessions'. His surviving works give but the slightest attention to personal details, and no one else thought of writing his life. Yet with a masterly insight and patience and skill Mr Chadwick has succeeded in painting a life-like and convincing portrait of this influential monk. While not oblivious to the weaknesses of Cassian, 'his Egyptian bias in favour of anchoritism', his lack of organising sense, his individualism that tended to discount the Church, his otherworldliness perhaps inevitable in his age, his Origenistic view of 'the spiritual life as the urge of man towards God rather than the gift of God to man', nevertheless he holds that in Cassian 'the Gospel has dominated Hellenism'. To Cassian it is due that 'Christian thought took a long stride between Evagrian and Benedictine spirituality. . . . Latin temperament, the temperament which refused to allow pillar-saints, was one factor; another was the translation of the ascetical terms into Latin words without the associations of the Greek. But the soundness of Cassian, his perception that Gauls were not Egyptians and that the Origenism of the desert could not suit Latin souls and Latin bodies without modification, contributed to the difference in ethos between eastern and western spirituality.' This book will assuredly be indispensable for the understanding of this development.

John H. S. Burleigh

Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson. Chosen and Edited by Evelyn Foley Braley. S.P.C.K. 1950. pp. xvi+255. 15s.

This is a charming and at the same time a deeply moving book, a welcome sequel to the three tense and luminously candid volumes in which Bishop Hensley Henson wrote his *Retrospect*, an autobiography and in some sense *apologia* which will remain an essential document for Anglican history. Sharing the feeling of many of the

Bishop's friends and admirers that the *Retrospect* did less than justice to the personal qualities which had endeared him to countless people in all walks of life and over-stressed the militant and controversial activity in which he had constantly been engaged, Canon Braley had urged him to select for publication a series of letters. A selection was accordingly made by the Bishop from his letter-books, but it was left to other hands to carry the project to completion after his death. With the selection before him, and the voluminous letter-books themselves put at his disposal, Canon Braley found that the correspondence of which Hensley Henson had methodically retained copies had been fully utilised in the preparation of his Memoirs. And believing that a large body of other and less official letters from his pen might have been preserved, he published an appeal for access to them. Within a short time almost 1500 were sent to him, long or short, which had been treasured alike for their own value and for their writer's sake. Out of this *cornucopia*, rich in sympathy and tenderness, in manly vigour and courage, in legal and learned and logical acumen, in spiritual wisdom and moral intensity, in public and patriotic spirit, in political and ecclesiastical insight and penetration, in pointed aphorisms and witty sallies and mordant criticisms, an infinite variety emerged of good things deserving to be remembered, and indeed easy to remember.

Canon Braley has had his reward. His faith has been justified, and we are all his debtors. He has performed his task as a labour of love, unobtrusively, but with skill and taste. As one who was privileged to know his accomplished and intrepid friend, and to meet him at distant intervals from his St. Margaret's to his Bishop Auckland days, and to follow his unique service to Christian truth and tolerance and charity, I voice the grateful appreciation of many readers beyond the Anglican pale who will prize this volume and return to it wistfully. One may doubt equally whether the autobiography required so urgently to be supplemented in order to reveal the whole man, or whether in the result any substantial change has been achieved in the impression which it left. The *Letters* and the *Retrospect* are touchingly alike in style and manners and in a certain air of great authority. Whether seated in a canon's stall or in a bishop's throne or at his writing-desk, Hensley Henson never forgot his office nor forsook his *cathedra*. The signature even below his private and personal letters regularly bears the appended 'Dunelm' or 'Bp.'. His gallant and provocative individuality was profoundly loyal to his order and sensitive to the just demands of discipline. He disliked and deprecated cope and mitre, he claimed a full share of the Catholic title for the Church Reformed and Protestant, he came to prophesy and desire the disestablishment of the Church of England to which his heart and trust was entirely dedicated, and was not intimidated by the threat or prospect or fear of Anglo-Catholic secession in that event, but he was not more jealous for liberty and tolerance than he was insistent upon law and order and dignity. And in these vivid letters, for all their intricate and occasional nature, the judicial note and the sense of a more than individual responsibility are seldom absent. Even friendship has to bow to the demands of candour, and opponents in ecclesiastical policy and debate are measured by a considering eye as open to their gifts and virtues as to their faults, and by a discernment which does not spare himself.

Together with the autobiography the *Letters* constitute a disclosure of a laborious and rather lonely life, never lightened by unselfconsciousness or by complacency and optimism, tinged always by the shadow of prophetic anxiety, but resolute, honest, and vigilantly poised for action. In the great library of memoirs bequeathed to Christendom by the ministry of the Church of England these volumes are assured of an honoured place. Written in a style commanding admiration and envy, they hold our attention with the ease of mastery. Graceful, lucid, abounding in energy, they move upon a classical level of expression, charged with wit and epigrams, equally penetrating in their analysis of the character of men and of movements, unsparingly severe towards ecclesiastical leadership and tendency which savoured to him of compromise, timidity, obscurantism, exclusive nervousness or illusion, yet instantly wise and kind and helpful in counsel to young and earnest minds. As we read we can understand his remarkable growth from the *enfant terrible* of Anglicanism to the dignity of a trusted Father in God, recoiling from extreme partisan views, accepting, at the price he knew he had to pay, the isolation of the cross-bench. Antagonisms he had to provoke, but enemies he did not make, and the English laity, peers and commoners, intellectuals and ordinary educated folk, listened to him eagerly and gave him reverence. A scholar at heart he was given small leisure to play a scholar's role, but upon every subject in history and doctrine and law with which he had to grapple he revealed an impressive power. Eloquence glowed in the shaping of his thought, his argument, his counsel, and every sentence that he wrote had the ring of a speaker's voice.

In the *Letters* there are quaint tricks of archaism in spelling which are persistent echoes of the Prayer Book's diction, and an amusing habit of bold underlining for emphasis. They are marks of the man, with their own touch of personal endearment. One is tempted to quote at length from the hundreds of letters and of appended excerpts, but it is vain to anthologise an anthology. Hundreds of pungent sentences will long be cherished in these vivacious pages. Scores of shrewd individual characterisations, of Davidson, Lang, Gore, Talbot, Headlam, William Temple, Bell, among them, take us behind the ecclesiastical curtain. Readers will turn to these instinctively and prize their frankness without forgetting their privacy.

Tribute is due to the Editor for his workmanlike handling of the material before him, his acceptance of a simple chronological order, his modest introduction and sparing notes and useful index. The book is attractively printed with few slips. Clever and precocious though the caricature is which forms the frontispiece, and which is reproduced on the loose cover behind a frosty screen or fence of bold poster-lettering, at least one reader regrets its prominence, and wishes that it had been relegated to the later pages. For the volume is a fine memorial of one whose departure from this restless world is still poignantly lamented, and it asks for, and deserves, an artistic prelude less strident and more dignified.

William A. Curtis

Two Religions. A comparative Study of some distinctive Ideas and Ideals in Hinduism and Christianity: being the Croall Lectures for 1948. By John Mackenzie, C.I.E., D.D. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

The Radhakrishnan Report on University Education in India has recommended a scheme of religious study which all students, whatever their subject, should be obliged to take. The assumption underlying the proposed scheme is that all religions are fundamentally the same, and that it is therefore of little importance what faith a man professes, provided he is tolerant of other religions and recognises them as other ways to the truth.

Dr Mackenzie's book is, in effect, an examination of this basic assumption of the proposed Indian religious policy, worked out by comparing the ways in which Hindus and Christians treat certain problems. The problems selected for study are the social order, the ethical problem, the doctrine of God, human destiny and the question of toleration. These have not been merely academic issues for Dr Mackenzie but in his long experience as Principal of Wilson College, Bombay, he has been confronted with them very often in dealing with the difficulties of his students. Dr Mackenzie summarises the Hindu attitude to each of the subjects under discussion, and then states the Christian view of the matter. This method is a natural consequence of his conviction that it is not possible to merge Christianity in Hinduism or Hinduism in Christianity, or to synthesise them in some higher unity.

One of the most important chapters is that dealing with the ethical problem. Here we have not only a clear statement of the two views, but a most suggestive examination of the basis of Christian ethical theory in the light of contemporary thinkers like Schweitzer. Dr Mackenzie believes that the Christian ethic is based on the love of God, which involves the acceptance of the world and the end of self-centredness. I cannot resist quoting the translation of a passage from the Bhagavadgita which Dr Mackenzie quotes to show that the Hindu ethic looks inward to find its basis within a man and not in relation to the world. The truly moral man is 'firm, holding body head and neck in unmoving equipoise, gazing on the end of his nose, and not looking about him'.

Dr Mackenzie describes the ordering of Hindu society and the exact system of duties belonging to each stage of life in the station in which the man finds himself, and shows the influence of the Gandhian struggle to remove untouchability, not only as this social system, but on the doctrines of transmigration and karma which underlie it. He suggests the need of more guidance in the conduct of life for the ordinary Christian, in words which echo what was said to the reviewer by a caste convert who had for many years been a worker for the Hindu Missionary Society, living as a Sadhu and trying to recall Hindus to the right observance of their duties. This man, while giving up all faith in any system of salvation by works, yet felt that Christian teaching in the Protestant churches was lamentably weak in not setting before believers a rule of life which they could follow and obey.

Possibly many ministers and lay people in this country may feel a book on Hinduism is of no concern to them, but, at all events so far as this book is concerned, they are quite wrong. Comparison with the developed system of religious thought called Hinduism throws much light on the essential nature of the Christian gospel, perhaps especially on the question of human destiny. I can find nothing in this book to criticise but much to be thankful for. The tone throughout is such that I think no Hindu would complain that his religion had been unfairly presented. It is interesting that the majority of modern writers in English on Hinduism come, as Dr Mackenzie does, from the great Scottish Colleges of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. The contribution of these colleges to the Indian Church is incalculable and through books like this something of their ethos spills over into the Church at home. No one will regret spending time or money on this excellent book.

L. W. BROWN

The New Testament against its Environment. By FLOYD V. FILSON. Student Christian Movement Press. 6s.

THIS excellent little book, the third in the Student Christian Movement's new series of 'Studies in Biblical Theology', bears the subtitle 'The Gospel of Christ the Risen Lord', and this indicates the author's concern throughout. It is indeed a relevant and salutary concern: have we not all read books on the Person and Work of Christ which, taking the Cross as the climax and completion of the historic drama, seek on this basis to construct a Christology and expound a doctrine of the Atonement, and either disregard the Resurrection or give it at most a secondary place, as though it were an appendix to the scheme of salvation, an addendum to the redeeming act of God? This is manifestly a falsification of the New Testament emphasis; and whether it appears in modern liberal theologies or (as it does somewhat surprisingly) in certain older forms of evangelicalism, it is bound to be disastrous. Christianity is the bridge spanning the immeasurable gulf between eternity and time, between the transcendent holiness of the Creator and the sin and finitude of the creature; but we do not begin to see Christianity steadily or whole until we perceive that the Resurrection is the keystone of the arch. The apostolic Church never preached the Easter faith as an appendix to the Gospel: this was, and is, the Gospel, the burning heart of the good news.

It is from this angle that Professor Floyd V. Filson has approached his task. And how refreshing it is in these days to come upon a book which breaks away from the prevalent fashion, as tedious as it is arbitrary, of dismissing as *Gemeindetheologie* the stupendous personal claim inherent in the words and actions of the Synoptic Christ! It is high time that the fallacy underlying much of this type of argument were clearly understood. If the apostolic Church regarded Jesus as Messiah (as it did), and if the highest claims are present in the Synoptic Christology (as they are), it does not necessarily follow that it was the Church that put them there, inserting them by a kind of retroactive imagination into a story where they did not originally belong. Emphatically not. Such explanations are much less substantial than that of the New Testament itself, which is that men came to see in Jesus the fulfilment of Messianic and indeed of all Old Testament expectation and to make the supreme identification precisely because Jesus Himself had made it first. Just as behind Paulinism lies the Christology of the earliest community, with which Paul is in essential accord, so behind this primitive Christology lies the claim and the consciousness of Jesus. And Dr Filson is entirely right to compel us to face the radical alternatives: 'The Christian message about Christ the Risen Lord and God as

His Father is either history's most influential mistake or it is a distinctive and valid message unique in content and in relevance for faith.'

Another debate which has sprung to new life in contemporary theology is that concerning the relationship within Christianity of historic framework and eternal truth. Bultmann has tried to solve this problem by a process of 'demythologising' the Gospel: the essential truth must be liberated from the cramping and distorting particularity of historical events. On the other hand, Cullmann, in *Christ and Time*, insists that it is precisely in such events that God makes Himself known: the God who acts in history is the only God the Bible knows. Therefore one can eliminate the time framework in which the Christian faith is set only at the price of mutilating the faith itself. In this debate Dr Filson would stand with Cullmann. 'The modern effort', he writes, 'to rescue God from the supposed disgrace of involvement in time is a fretting which the Bible does not share.' 'The New Testament never floats off into the stratosphere of timelessness to seek there a perfect bliss.' This is well and wisely said. It does need emphasising that the faith of the New Testament has nothing whatever in common with the familiar modern attitude which, regarding concern for historic events as being an indication of defective spirituality and intellectual triviality, seeks to escape beyond history into the freedom of timeless, transcendent, discarnate truth—thus making itself more 'spiritual' than God. For the Spirit of whom the apostolic Church spoke was always the Spirit of Jesus—and Jesus had walked the stony earth, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and endured the Cross and despised the shame.

Perhaps the most satisfying section of Dr Filson's book is the last, which is entitled 'Led by the Spirit'. Here there is a timely insistence on the eschatological quality of Pentecost, a fact which is too often overlooked. Here also is a warning against confusing Paulinism with individualistic mysticism. 'To be "in Christ", while it is a great personal experience and privilege, is a privilege which inevitably puts a man into the Church.' Here, too, is a plea for restoring emotion to its rightful place from which the exaggerated intellectual emphasis of Protestantism has sometimes driven it. After showing that the apostolic Church displayed considerably more emotion in its worship and life than the average liberal Protestant Church today, the author adds pointedly: 'In view of the widely admitted weakness of present-day Protestantism, the difference is not automatic proof of the inferiority of the New Testament.'

Throughout this important study, Dr Filson has kept in view the Jewish-Hellenistic environment of the apostolic Church. Between Judaism and the new religion much common ground existed, and there were wide areas of agreement: neither Jesus nor His immediate followers disowned or abandoned the ancestral faith. Yet Christianity can never be explained simply by its Jewish background. The very hostility Jesus encountered indicates that Judaism itself instinctively sensed a difference which was fundamental and decisive, going much deeper than any contingent ecclesiastical rivalries and reaching down to the profoundest theological issues. Christ 'came to fulfil'; yet what He brought, what indeed He was in Himself, was a fresh, original revelation. Still less is Christianity to be explained from any of the cults and philosophies of the Hellenistic world. It might indeed be argued that here the author is merely reopening a controversy which is now ended: has not the past generation witnessed an emphatic repudiation of the type of scholarship which, carried away by discoveries in the field of Comparative Religion, interpreted primitive Christianity in terms of Oriental dramas of redemption and dissolved the faith in Hellenistic mysticism? But Dr Filson is right: for the battle to defend the uniqueness and originality of our holy faith against de-supernaturalising explanations has to be fought anew in every generation. And we ought to be grateful to him for showing so clearly in this book how that battle should be waged. James S. Stewart

The Doctrine of the Atonement. By Leonard Hodgson. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

This book has all the qualities that one has learned to expect in the work of its author. As he is aware, what he now gives us might indeed be described as what he said twenty-three years ago in the fifth chapter of his very original work *And was Made Man*, but it is also organically connected with all that he has written since then about the Incarnation and the Trinity. He shows little trace of the influence of the Dialectical theology of contemporary Continental Protestantism, and never refers to Barth, and only once, in passing, to Brunner. (Why does he call Brunner a Lutheran?) He stands distinctly, though not narrowly, in the Anglican theological tradition, yet he belongs to no school, but has a consistent position of his own. Above all, his honest thinking is refreshingly free from jargon and his Biblical interpretation is really *interpretation* in plain language.

Dr Hodgson is greatly concerned to maintain a view of the atonement which will give it an objective, universal, even cosmic significance, as something once for all wrought by Christ and effective for all sins past, present and future, even for sinners who never heard of Christ in their earthly life. How can this be so? It can only be so because in Christ God Himself (who as 'unincarnate God' works far beyond the bounds of Church and Christendom) lived on earth as man, 'entered into the sphere where sin produces pain, overcame the pain by bearing it with love unconquerable and unconquered, and carried that victory of love over sin right up to and through the point of death'. Thus 'once for all, in the history of this world, God, who is both the source and the object of all the acts of His creatures, has won the right to forgive their sins without the least diminution of His eternal goodness which is the ground of all our hope' (p. 83). But this redeeming work of Christ, accomplished once for all in the 'one oblation of Himself, once offered', has to be worked out in history through the instrumentality of the church, which is 'the body of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world', and which is (in words quoted from Dr Newton Flew) 'in the first place the object, and then the organ or instrument of God's saving purpose for mankind'. And thus the mounting graph of the parabola of evil, which reached its summit when Christ was crucified, has been descending ever since; or, to use the hour-glass figure, the purpose of God, which first kept narrowing itself down to one people, and then a remnant, and then one Man, Jesus Christ, began from that point an expanding process of the salvation of mankind through the church.

Here the argument inevitably becomes involved in the question, so ubiquitous in theology today, of the relation of the kingdom of Christ and His redemption to the course of mundane history. Somewhat unexpected, and certainly contrary to current fashions, is the statement that 'a cardinal point in the history of God's working out of this purpose in and through the Church was Constantine's Edict of Milan, issued in the year 313'. 'In the continuing body of His earthly work, the Church, He has again immersed Himself in the cross-currents of human history; the year 313 saw Him take a step forward and make that immersion yet more thorough.' But this leads to a long and illuminating Appended Note on Church and State, which must have had a quite special relevance in America where these lectures were delivered; and a little later to a fine treatment of the issue, so much discussed today, between the more pessimistic and the more optimistic view of terrestrial history. 'Shall the hour-glass expand until all creation is brought to share in the glory of the risen Lord? Or is the world to continue to its end as a mixture of good and evil . . . ?' Dr Hodgson's answer is that 'it is not given to us to know the future destiny of this world in space and time', though in a footnote he confesses that Dr Alan Galloway's recent book, *The Cosmic Christ*, shows convincingly that the Bible favours the more optimistic view. Very soundly he goes on to show how the true grounds of the Christian's vocation to strive for better things in the world do not depend on an answer to this question.

Dr Hodgson neither adopts nor rejects *in toto* any of the traditional types of theory of the atonement, but finds in all of them contributions to the truth, and adds something original. The most original element is in the account of how God, incarnate in Christ, met evil in such a way that He 'won the right' to forgive men's sins. All theories of atonement have to wrestle with the question: How and in what sense did Calvary make divine forgiveness possible? Did it do this objectively for God or only subjectively for men? And if the former, why was that necessary? Dr Hodgson's answer goes deep, and it is based on a penetrating analysis of all that is meant by punishment and forgiveness. Yet one cannot help wondering how much turns upon the phrase 'won the right', which almost demands inverted commas because it sounds so anthropomorphic—even if we recognise, as Dr Hodgson does in a long Appended Note, that we are here involved in the insoluble problem of the antinomy between time and eternity in our thought of God.

The idea of cosmic redemption is in the air today, and is in great need of being more fully thought out. But Dr Hodgson's rich and wise book has made its contribution. And I do not know any more impressive statement of the difference it makes to have an objective reality of atonement, as something accomplished once for all and for ever effective, than is given in his closing pages.

D. M. Baillie

Natural Science and the Spiritual Life. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press, 1951. pp. 43. 5s.

Principal Baillie's Discourse to the British Association deserves the highest praise, and its publication in this somewhat expensive form is eminently justified. He begins his diagnosis of the tension between the outlooks of religion and of natural science by repudiating the idea of an iron curtain across the field of our experience, with science excluded from the one side and its totalitarian right proclaimed on the other. He traces the tension back to Socrates, as reported in the Phaedo, pp. 98-99, and concludes that though 'Socrates was wrong in his impatience with the search for secondary and mechanical causes, wrong in his desire to interpolate final causes into the chain of scientific explanation, and wrong in his belief that the detail of nature could be deduced from the ideal ends which it was ordained to serve', 'he was right in his conviction that it is far more vitally important for us to know whither nature tends than to know how it works, and that our interest in its working must ultimately evaporate, if we are unable to believe that it tends towards some good' (p. 38). He uses the important work of Mr Michael Foster to exhibit the Christian grounds upon which Bacon and Descartes stood when they initiated modern natural science which he contrasts with that of the ancient world in two respects: its dependence upon empirical observation and experiment, and the measure of control over natural processes which it seeks to put into the hands of man. And with von Hügel's help he sets a positive value on the strain placed upon our spirits by the impersonality of nature which only *modern* science has fully acknowledged. The 'two diverse ways in which the whole territory of our human experience may be approached and explored' have never been charted as lucidly and as surely as in this Discourse. Here is the pure gold which a whole generation of thinkers have been trying to refine out of the ore which they have quarried. It is a book to buy and to keep.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE

Reformed Dogmatics, set out and illustrated from the sources, by HEINRICH HEPPE. English translation by G. T. Thomson. Allen and Unwin Ltd. 50s.

THIS massive book was first produced in 1861 with the avowed purpose of giving a systematic and faithful account of classical Calvinist doctrine, profusely illustrated by carefully selected passages from the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There can be no doubt that it was a magnificent achievement, as its prolonged use in theological seminaries testifies. In 1934 it was exhaustively corrected and reissued by Ernst Bizer, with a foreword by Karl Barth. Now it has appeared in English, as useful and powerful as ever, even though its interest for most readers will be mainly historical. It can be said of few books that they are improved by translation, but there can be no question about the fact that Professor G. T. Thomson has improved this stiff and somewhat stodgy German volume immensely. The long citations in Latin are carefully rendered into English, though particularly important expressions remain in the original, while the Scriptural passages referred to are given in full in the body of the text. It is now a magnificent textbook both for the student of historical theology who wishes to gain a first and yet compendious knowledge of classical Calvinist teaching, without working through dusty folios of Latin, and also for the student who wishes to have in English a volume of proper dogmatics to which he can turn from the countless volumes produced by modern dilettante theology, and in which he can exercise the reflection of his faith within the context of the Church and its science.

In his foreword Karl Barth writes that at first when he made acquaintance with this work he found it 'out of date, unattractive, almost like a table of logarithms, dreary to read, stiff and eccentric on almost every page', but when he studied it he found it very different. 'I was rewarded', he says, 'with the discovery, that here at last I was in the atmosphere in which the road by way of the Reformers to Holy Scripture was a more sensible and natural one to tread, than the atmosphere, now only too familiar to me, of the theological literature determined by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. I found a dogmatics which had both forms and substance, oriented upon the central indications of the Biblical evidences for revelation, which it also managed to follow out in detail with astonishing richness—a dogmatics which by adopting and sticking to main lines of the Reformation attempted alike a worthy continuation of the doctrinal constructions of the older Church, and was also to cherish and preserve continuity with the ecclesiastical science of the Middle Ages. I found myself visibly in the circle of the Church, and, moreover, in accordance with such prototypes, in the region of Church science, respectable of its kind. I had come to be amazed at the long, peaceful breathing, the sterling quality, the relevant strictness, the superior style, the methods confident at least themselves, which this "orthodoxy" had wrought. I had cause for astonishment at its wealth of problems and the sheer beauty of its trains of thought.' To one who has himself used Heppe's *Reformierte Dogmatik* for fifteen years, Barth's words appear strikingly apt.

The theology which this volume contains comes mainly from the post-Reformation period when on the one hand the great doctors of the Reformed Church were doing battle with their Roman opponents like Suarez and Bellarmine, and when on the other hand Cartesian philosophy was beginning to dominate the thought of the West. Behind it all there stands not only the genius of John Calvin and Peter Martyr, though these do not come into the picture sufficiently, but the thorough and laborious exegetical study of the Scriptures in Cocceius, and the exact scientific precision of Polanus. Here too we have the theology of Wollebius who gave Milton his theological stuffing, and the teaching of Witsius, Marckius, Pictetus and others whose works were for long the theological text-books not only in Scotland but in England, as College libraries in Oxford and Cambridge bear witness. The great characteristic of this theology, however, is that it is a brilliant synthesis of the teaching of Calvin and the Reformers with the dialectic of Scholasticism. In other words, here we see the great Reformed convictions amalgamated with a species of the very Aristotelianism from which Calvin revolted in his opposition to the 'frigid teaching of the Sorbonne'. It is understandable that the doctors of the Reformed Church in defending themselves against Roman attack should make use of the weapons of their opponents, but in doing so, they bound up the substance of their dogmatics with a form which was alien to that substance. There can be no doubt that with such handling and transmission the substance of Reformed dogmatics suffered both change and hardening, and became at the same time embroiled with presuppositions which the rising critical philosophy was rightly to call in question. One cannot but admire the greatness of these men—few modern theologians have attained the stature of Polan or Heidegger—but it is a sad reflection that in the seventeenth century, in Switzerland and Germany as well as in Holland, the great Calvinists came to imprison the essentially Biblical, dynamic teaching of Calvin in arid logical forms.

We may take a single, though prominent instance—the doctrine of predestination. Calvin's genius in treating of this doctrine was to keep it close to the Scriptural text, even in regard to the difficult chapters in the Epistle to the Romans which few theologians have had the courage and integrity to face honestly, but that meant also thinking of predestination in its Biblical eschatological context. To keep predestination within its eschatological setting, however, where it belongs, is to resist the temptation to make logic take the place of eschatology. In his controversial writings, for example against Pighius, Calvin succumbed to the temptation to give logic too great a place in predestination, but elsewhere in his *Commentaries* and even in the *Institutes*, it is otherwise. In the *Commentaries* he reminds us again and again that where the Word of God blinds and hardens the reprobate, it takes place through their own self-will and it belongs truly to themselves, but is only accidental as regards the Word. Reprobation is only to be understood in the eschatological situation where the Gospel that Christ died for all men becomes a savour of life to life and of death to death. Thus in the last edition of the *Institutes* he reminds us that, in regard to reprobation and election, the will of God may appear to our apprehension manifold, but God does not in Himself will opposites like that. This is a mystery which transcends our senses, and which will only be disclosed at the last day. That is to say, Calvin resisted the temptation to think out the problem of predestination and reprobation to the end by means of logic, in the realisation that faith involves an eschatological suspension of logical necessity.

That is not the case here, where eschatology has been transmuted into the federal idea, and all that remains is a harmless chapter at the end on glorification. Election is turned into the philosophical conception of absolute particular predestination, and is more Thomist than Calvinist. And yet there is a great deal here even about the divine decrees which repays close study. Thus for example, it is realised that in the strict sense Christ is Himself the meaning of election, and our election is through incorporation into Him. Election is primarily a corporate matter, and only secondarily does it have to do with individuals, and not even with individuals as such but with individuals as members of the Body of Christ. Thus Heidegger is cited as saying: 'Even from all eternity God did not elect individuals rent from each other but joined together. He chose us all united as one Body in Christ the Head.' That is the genuine thought of Calvin and this volume again and again leads us back through much modern misunderstanding to the Reformers and their Biblically-grounded doctrines.

That is particularly clear in the doctrine of the Church. It is not generally realised that it was Calvin and his successors who revived the doctrine that the Church is the living Body of Christ, a doctrine which Roman theology had set far into the background and well-nigh lost in its emphasis upon the juridical and institutional character of the Church. That Roman Catholic theology today is so deeply concerned about the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ is undoubtedly due to Reformed dogmatics as much as to their revived interest in Biblical exegesis.

There is no space here to go further into the immense theological wealth of this volume, but those who study it will soon learn how worth-while it is to reflect upon the tiniest point in Christian dogma for the light it sheds upon the whole. The appearance of this book in English at this stage in history, however, is undoubtedly a judgment upon us for failing to produce our own dogmatics, though its appearance is also a welcome sign that the Church is once again prepared to undertake the hard work of critical and constructive theological reflection designed to issue not in static dogmas but in formulations of such precision and power that they will be adequate instruments of the Church in her battle against the insidious ideologies of our time. True dogma is a weapon of battle, both in the struggle of the Church against herself in order to protect her from preaching herself instead of the Word of God, and in the struggle against attacks from without. No theologian of the *ecclesia semper reformanda* will wish to return to the great theology of the seventeenth century with its time-conditioned schematisms of thought in order to take it over, but he can and ought to return to the study of it both in order to discern the relation of theological formulation to its inevitable implication in contemporary thought, and to work his way through this great Reformed tradition back to the Holy Scriptures themselves. Meantime, in the words of Professor Thomson he will find this theology not only instructive; 'to an age fed on the husks of enlightenment and today craving for the true light of divine revelation Heppe is manna, and that in plenty.'

One cannot conclude this review without expressing our gratitude to Professor Thomson for his painstaking translation which now puts this volume within the reach of all our students, and also to the Publishers who have done theology a great service by undertaking to publish in these difficult times a volume of such weight and worth.

Thomas F. Torrance

The Earliest Christian Confessions. By Oscar Cullmann. Translation by J. K. S. Reid. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

Few scholars of recent years have thrown such fresh vivid light upon the Early Christian Church as Professor Oscar Cullmann of the Universities of Basel and Paris, while his great work *Christ and Time* is certainly the most exciting work on eschatology since the epoch-making work of Albert Schweitzer. Here is one of his smaller but no less important works (lucidly and excellently translated into English by the Rev. J. K. S. Reid) which is a signal contribution to our knowledge of the Church in the first two centuries.

The problem Professor Cullmann has set himself here is to examine the origins of the confessions of faith. 'Our object', he writes, 'is not to sketch a history of the development of the later confessions—that is, of those which in a fixed text served one of the communities of the ancient Church as rule of faith. We occupy ourselves rather with their "pre-history", and ask how, at a time when everything was still fluid, and before certain types of symbol became fixed, the Church came to work out formulas comprehensive of the faith. This prehistory stretches in all over the first century and the second half of the second. But to understand the forces which disclose themselves at this time, we must consider their later development, and from there proceed to the beginnings' (p. 7).

Four questions are posed and answered in four separate chapters. Why did Christians need to have, besides Scripture, an 'apostolic' formula to summarise the faith they professed? What circumstances brought this necessity about? What is the composition of the first formulas, and how did they develop in the earliest times? What is the essential content of the Christian faith according to the earliest formulas?

In answer to the first question Professor Cullmann points out that the early Church needed a formulated summary of the faith by which to indicate the common core of the early tradition, as a standard or rule of faith by which to distinguish what is central in it from what is derived. Trouble was taken to emphasise both the objective and apostolic character of the rule of faith and to eliminate from it any suspicion of arbitrariness—that was particularly important when Christian tradition was oral only, but equally important during the period when certain writings were to be distinguished from others as canonical. 'The desire here', remarks Professor Cullmann, 'was not to set up *every* ecclesiastical tradition above Scripture. It was rather a matter of dethroning every *future* tradition in the name of *apostolic* tradition' (p. 13).

To the second question the reply is made that five simultaneous factors were at work, baptism and catechumenism, regular worship (liturgy and preaching), exorcism, persecution, and polemic against heretics. Traces of the way in which confessional formulas arose in these diverse experiences of the primitive community are to be found in the New Testament itself. 'The affirmation that several circumstances contributed to the formation of the confessions of faith should prevent us from postulating *a priori* any unified and uniform formula of faith in New Testament times' (p. 33). It was apparently this multiplicity of formulas corresponding to the multiplicity of circumstances which opened the road to a progressive unification and fusion in a summary of the faith.

When he comes to examine the formal structure and composition of the first formulations, Professor Cullmann finds that in the overwhelming majority they contain one article alone, the Christological. Although there are quite clearly diverse contemporaneous constructions of confessions, and although bipartite formulas (God, Christ) exist from the oldest period, Professor Cullmann claims to see a general line of development. In the New Testament, purely Christological formulas are by far the most frequent, bipartite are seldom found, and tripartite are altogether lacking (trinitarian declarations in the N.T. have rather a liturgical character, and are not confessions of faith). After Ignatius of Antioch one-membered formulas (Christ alone) are less frequent, while by the middle of the second century three-membered formulas (God, Christ, Spirit) are attested for the first time. There is apparently, then, a general development leading from the purely Christological formula up to formulations of several articles. 'The originally most widespread Christian confession is quite certainly the *purely Christological* . . . Proclamation of Christ is *the starting-point of every Christian confession*' (p. 38 f.).

It was largely the employment of the confession in *baptism* which made necessary a tripartite formula, in which the Spirit figures as the effect of baptism. 'This development was favoured by the ancient liturgical tripartite formulas existing independently of the confessions of faith and by the triple invocation of the *name* in baptism' (p. 43). An interesting and highly significant fact emerges here, namely, that *the forgiveness of sins*, which in the oldest formulations clearly belongs to the Christological confession, being mentioned along with the death of Christ, becomes displaced as a result of the baptismal liturgy, and is transposed into the third article, where it is subordinated to affirmations about the Holy Spirit.

When he comes to the last question, Professor Cullmann has little difficulty in showing that the essential content of these early Christian confessions is mainly Christological. Theologically, faith in God is really a function of faith in Christ, for God is not confessed as Creator, but as He who raised our Lord from the dead, and conferred majesty upon Him. Further, the Holy Spirit is very often determined through the confession of Christ. In other words, 'faith in God the Father and in the Holy Ghost really constitute a part of the essential substance of faith in Christ, who stands as the sole object of confession in the majority of the earliest confessions' (p. 49). It would appear that with the rise of the tripartite formulations, particularly when they followed the logical order of ideas rather than the order of faith (in God the Father through Christ the Son), the centre of gravity in the New Testament tended to be displaced with the altered perspective, so that the strongly Christocentric character, discernible as the essential principle of the primitive confession, was weakened, though by no means eliminated.

Towards the end of his essay, Professor Cullmann points out that, though the mention of the second coming of Christ is not frequent in these early confessions, this does not mean that eschatology plays a small part, but rather that the hope of the advent of Christ was for them included in the certainty of His resurrection and elevation to the right hand of God. 'They believed in the future Kingdom of God because they believed in the present reign of Christ' (p. 42).

This modest little book has not yet received the discussion its great importance deserves. It is packed with the most illuminating and suggestive ideas, and repays the closest study. Its implications both for the interpretation of the New Testament and for the understanding of theological development are too far-reaching to be discussed here, but its outstanding contribution is the disclosure of the predominantly Christocentric character of early Christian confessions, and of the fact that the historical kernel of the developed *Credo* is at the same time the dogmatic kernel.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Christianity on the Frontier. By JOHN A. MACKAY. Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d.

THE President of Princeton Theological Seminary stands in the front rank both as theologian and missionary statesman. The special worth of such a relatively unusual combination of qualities is evident in this volume which, though a compilation of essays and papers written over a period of years during and since the war, has an impressive unity of emphasis because, in the author's words, it has 'a great concern and a great conviction'. In incisive, vigorous and passionate language, Dr Mackay estimates the situation in which Christianity is placed in the contemporary world. There is vitality, gravity, hopefulness on every page of this educative, stirring, courageous and open-eyed book. Preachers who desire (and what preacher should not desire?) to obtain solid assistance and dynamic inspiration in their difficult task of relating essential and unchanging Christian truth to the rapidly altering and exceedingly tumultuous world scene will find both in every chapter—and in such a form as will quicken the sense of confidence and urgency in all their ministerial work.

Since the publication of the present book, Dr Mackay has been writing characteristically on what he calls 'splendour in the abyss'. He regards our time as springtime, not late fall or early winter in human affairs—a terrible springtime, doubtless, with floods and gales, but with brightness beyond and even now breaking in upon us. It is the same type of assurance, sombre but invincible, that is the background of this book. Brave realism is too often disjoined from triumphant hope, but not in the world situation as Dr Mackay sees it through Christian eyes.

Perhaps the best way to state precisely what we may expect in this book is to quote a few sentences from the preface. 'The *concern* is this—the Christian Church and all Christians everywhere should live a "frontier" life. They should be in that place where life's most crucial issues await a Christian decision; they should be there too where life presents new areas to be possessed in the name of Christ. The frontier is a place of tension . . . the place beyond which lies unoccupied territory. . . . The *conviction* is that Jesus Christ, the Word of God Incarnate, shall triumph in history, and not merely beyond history.' In the third chapter which is devoted to a full study of what the 'frontier' is, Dr Mackay writes: 'The Church is truly the Church solely in the measure in which it lives a pilgrim life upon the road of God's unfolding purpose, keeping close to the rugged boundaries of His ever-expanding Kingdom. Only upon the Frontier, ready to trek into the unknown, waiting for the Leader's word at midnight or at noonday, can the Church be saved from the fate of institutions that have staked their all upon a human something that Time has marked for dissolution.' The application of all this is worked out briefly in the political, cultural, evangelical and missionary spheres. Our world, a world of perilous vacuum, is summoned to abandon the bypaths where life cannot but be empty, to venture out in obedience to the Word which has been spoken by God, the Word which contains the how, the why, and the what of the truth by which alone mankind is to be saved. The crucial alternatives before us are 'The Glory of God or the Dishonour of Man', 'The Frontier with Christ or the Sanctuary without Him', 'Apocalyptic Hope or Contemporary Despair'.

Dr Mackay is one of the greatest experts of our time on the religious situation in South America, and that is evident in at least three of the chapters in the second part of the volume, and particularly in the long, comprehensive and enlightening chapter on Protestantism. The nature and genius of Protestantism, its classical and radical forms and the facts of their present distribution, the essentials of its distinctive theology—all these are dealt with in this chapter. As a result of a lifelong study of the vast issues involved in the claims of the Roman Catholic Church and of close contact with it in South America, Dr Mackay has reached the firm conclusion that Romanism, by the nature of its claims, has ceased to be a true Church and is the greatest of all sects. So he has some candid things to say on Roman Catholicism, especially in relation to religious freedom. On the other hand he has hopeful things to say about the increasing influence of the Bible in South America, with a consequent new understanding of Christ, both within the Roman Church and outside. He even feels that it is possible to say emphatically that 'evangelical Christianity is the most significant and transforming spiritual influence in Latin America today'. As for contemporary Protestantism, Dr Mackay believes that 'its heydey is not behind it, but before it', that it is entering on a new era, that it is rediscovering its soul in the rediscovery of Christian orthodoxy, the affirmation of Evangelical Catholicity, a reawakened concern for the secular order, and in a demand for an ecumenical theology.

George S. Gunn

A Manual of Doctrine. By J. M. Bates. Presbyterian Bookroom, Christchurch and Dunedin. 9s. 6d.

This work is claimed in the Foreword as 'an important landmark in the publishing done by the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand'. It is not only a publishing feat; it is a theological achievement. Within the 250 or so pages of this book, there is contained a statement and presentation of the doctrines of the Christian Faith, and the further the present reviewer advanced through the pages, the more they claimed his respect and admiration.

It would not, I fancy, be true to suggest that this is a highly original contribution to theology, either in plan or content. This is after all not its aim or intention. The work was commissioned by the General Assembly of the Church as an 'official Manual of Doctrine', and the author has had the criticisms and suggestions of Committee to take into account. The book is therefore necessarily comprehensive; the writer does not conceive it to be his duty to single out for approval any one of a number of different views on, for example, the last judgment or the exact meaning of Holy Baptism. But even more marked than its comprehensiveness is its reliability. Sampling again and again reveals the good balance and right judgment that persists from the early pages on the Inspiration of the Bible to the last chapters on the Work of the Church. It is a very *honest* book; it acknowledges the questions that have to be asked, and it does not evade the issues demanding treatment.

It is hardly to be expected that one should be in agreement with all that such a book says. The present writer found the treatment of man in its initial stages a little eclectic, and he was left wondering whether the purpose at this point was dogmatic or apologetic. It is perhaps not quite good enough to say that 'there are two forces operating in man the sinner: God and self', without explaining that it is only a self already out of alignment that could come into conflict with its Maker. And sometimes the evident desire for balance *seems* to betray the writer into standing on both sides of a fence at the same time, e.g. law as 'mankind's provision to deal with the perversion caused by sin' (p. 113) and as 'rooted in the will of God' (p. 190). But these are minor blemishes. The most serious limitation of the book is, I imagine, the account of the Sacraments, which is in itself a little meagre, and hardly succeeds in presenting them as an integrated part of the life of the Church.

This is a publication of which the New Zealand Presbyterian Church may well be proud. It is worthy of the widest notice and use by Church members. I confess to a rather uneasy wonder whether it will in fact achieve this. The suspicion I have is that it *may* prove to be either too big a volume, or too small—too big for large numbers of ordinary Church folk to tackle who would not shrink from something rather smaller; too small to be for the student much more than a refresher course—though an admirable one. I hope these fears are proved entirely groundless.

J. K. S. Reid

The Fulness of Christ. The Church's Growth into Catholicity: being a report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

In this notable document, at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a group of Anglican Evangelicals under the chairmanship of the Archdeacon of Sheffield have made an irenic attempt to account for the contrasts of 'catholic' and 'protestant' theology, parallel to the attempt already made by a group of Anglo-catholic scholars who presented their findings to the Archbishop in the document entitled *Catholicity*. This is not a studied reply to *Catholicity*, but rather an independent and constructive approach to the problem of unity, based upon the double belief that 'our Lord's identification with the Church, which is His Body, and His Lordship over it, are the foundation-truths underlying alike the Church's unity, her holiness, and her catholicity'. In the preface, these scholars go on to say: 'Though in every age she had only imperfectly apprehended and expressed the mind of Christ, yet by His Spirit she has been promised and, when obedient, has been given, throughout her history, a growing apprehension of the revelation of God in Christ of which the apostolic testimony in Holy Scripture is the abiding record. We cannot, therefore, draw any line across history and seek simply to return to the standards of an age when the visible unity of the Church was unbroken; nor regard visible unity as guaranteeing loyalty to the gospel which the Church is meant both to preach and to embody. It is the whole history of the Church, including that of its disrupted life, which πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως has reflected the glory of her Lord, and the distortions of that image are not confined to the age of the divided Church.'

With the same theological balance and a deep understanding of the fulness of the Gospel these Churchmen discuss the development of the Church and her doctrine in the biblical perspective of God's saving acts in history. Without any wilfulness or prejudice in their interpretation of other views and churches, 'catholic' or 'protestant', they give a convincing exposition of their findings that the Church's unity is to be apprehended only in the fulness of Christ which is the destiny of the Church, and to be realised by growth into that fulness. In five successive chapters they discuss The Growth of the Church into Fulness; Growth towards Fulness at the Reformation; Tension, Schism and Modification; Towards Resolution of the Conflict; the Road to Fulness: Unity in Tension. The great point maintained throughout is that while the Church is at once 'the given community' (the creation of God in Christ) and 'the willed community' (of those who are called and surrender themselves to God's purpose), the given unity of the Church is to be realised only by growth through tension. This tension is grounded not simply upon a variety that comes from richness of experience, but has as its deep underlying cause sin and rebellion against the will of God. Tension within the Church is not therefore a good thing in itself, yet it can be overruled by the providence of God for good. Thus in the actual circumstances in which the Church lives, in history with its admitted failures and sin, tension is made to play a vital part in the growth of the Church. 'Both the heightening of tension and its resolution seem to be indispensable, in our human situation, to the progress of the Church. The new insights help forward the development of the Church through variety. The resolution of tension through conflict safeguards that unity of the Church, within which alone the varieties can be both safe and significant.' The great tension that has characterised the history of the Church is that which broke out into conflict at the Reformation, when there was a decided growth towards fulness in Christ—although the Roman Church drew back and declined to accept that growth, thus bearing the major responsibility for the schism. But if the full gain of that growth toward fulness is to be conserved and increased both sides of the tension must be reunited—without however in any way being disloyal to the gospel. In such a reunited Church tensions will be inevitable, and could only be avoided at the expense of growth. Such a reunion could be possible only at a very high level of spiritual life in which both 'catholic' and 'protestant' sides of the tension must be guided by the Holy Spirit speaking through the Biblical witness.

The relation between the Church of Evangelical Christendom and the Church of Rome is not within the immediate perspective of this document. What we have set forth here is the relation between the 'catholic' and 'protestant' theology within the perspective of the Churches of the West which all belong to the movement that stemmed from the Reformation, and particularly within the perspective of the Church of England itself, where these contrasting tensions have long been evident, and where, it is claimed, an experiment of unity in tension is being carried out. Upon the merit and outcome of that Anglican experiment, these scholars do not claim to be able to express any final verdict, but they say quite emphatically: 'We believe that only by accepting the spiritual challenge of unity in tension can the two traditions resolve their differences and open the way for a new growing of the Church into a fuller apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus. And if this be so, the resources of the Spirit are covenanted to those who seek to do His will and follow His leading.'

Here we have more than anywhere else in contemporary Anglicanism the authentic voice of the Church of England, the Church which in her great Elizabethan days stood forth as the Champion of the Churches of the Reformation, exercising a conciliatory influence in her balanced and comprehensive outlook, the Church which in her Caroline divines expounded a theology which was at once catholic and evangelical, within which certainly the pendulum swung at times from one extreme to the other, but the Church also which has not refused to learn from a Calvinist, a Wesleyan, or a Tractarian theology. There are still extremes within the Church of England, ranging from bitter Anglo-Catholicism to bigoted Ultra-Protestantism, but without any doubt *The Fulness of Christ* speaks with the authority of a great proportion of the Church of England behind it and expresses the genuinely Anglican mind in its growth through many new insights since the Reformation and through tension to its present condition. That is all the more highly significant when it is remembered that those who have combined to present this comprehensive and representative statement belong to the Evangelical Tradition in the Church of England, a tradition which, it is clear from this document, has learned more from the *whole* history of the Church of England than any other group within its bounds, and which now at last holds forth the promise of a great theology which is both dogmatic and living, with due appreciation of the Anglo-Catholic and Non-Conformist emphases in the English Church.

If this review now turns to criticism, let it be said right away that it is meant to be constructive. Far from detracting from the significance of this really great publication, what follows is intended as a contribution toward the growth through tension into fulness of which the document speaks, as well as a contribution toward a deeper understanding between Anglican and Reformed theology, as represented by the Church of England and the Church of Scotland in particular.

There is no doubt about the fact that the theology of *The Fulness of Christ* stands within the tradition of the Reformation and its rediscovery of the living God of the Bible and of the fact that the whole history of the Church is contingent upon His creative will. Whereas the Anglo-Catholics in their document *Catholicity* work with a structure of catholicity embedded in the stream of history and interpret the development of the Church and understand her unity in terms of that ideal pattern which they claim to discern in the undivided Church of the early centuries, these Evangelical Churchmen interpret the development of the Church in terms of her divine destiny which is only imperfectly apprehended in history, and understand her unity in terms of her growth into the fulness of Christ. To be sure, the Church has an unalterable and static element which is her apostolicity, the faithful standing upon the teaching of the Apostles, but her faith is always proleptic, looking forward to a fulness which has not yet been made manifest. 'The over-emphasis on the static and the unalterable, the loss of the sense of pioneering in the understanding of Christ, has hindered the Church in its attempt to realise its own nature.'

This position is based upon the teaching of the New Testament in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the very title of the document being taken from Eph. 4.13, and its idea of growth mainly from the second, third, and fourth chapters of the same Epistle—but there is this significant difference, that here the idea of growth is interpreted more as *biological* development than as *eschatological* fulfilment. That is apparent from the very first page, while throughout the whole discussion the *destiny* or *end* of the Church is interpreted almost entirely in the sense of *telos* to the neglect of *eschaton*. In the N.T. both aspects of *end* are to the fore and are understood in terms of each other, for the Word which governs the growth of the Church is both *συντελῶν* and *συντέμνων*. In other words, it is the notion of divine judgment that is lacking in the view of growth expounded here. They say quite explicitly that the growth of the Church through tension is not simply a growth through imperfection as the lack of completeness, for imperfection exists also under the aspect of sin and rebellion against the will of God; and indeed it is partly because they recognise that sin and ignorance marked the primitive Church as well as the Church of later days that they cannot agree with the 'catholic' position. And further, they say very rightly: 'We turn back to the Word of God, to find there the nature of the Church, as it is set forth in the will and purpose of God. In so far as we penetrate to deeper understanding of that will, we shall be able to establish criteria by which the Church in history can be judged, and by which true growth can be distinguished from perversion.' Nevertheless, they do not appear to recognise or at least do not expound the Biblical teaching that the development of the Church has *as its essential pattern in history the death and resurrection of Christ*. That was one of the great insights of the Reformation. The Reformers used to point to the fact that the Messianic community in Old Testament times was always subject to judgment, and being plunged into disaster and death, but that God intended that in order to show by the destruction of the Temple, by the abrogation of the cult, and the break in the continuity of the priestly succession, that the Kirk in all ages has her life and continuity in a marvellous preservation, in being constantly called out of death into life. If the essential pattern of the Incarnation, *death and resurrection*, was manifest in the Church before the Incarnation, how much more after it, when the Church as the Body of Christ goes out into history bearing about in her the dying and the rising of the Lord Jesus? That is the pattern which is sacramentally enacted in Baptism and Holy Communion, and which has its counterpart in the historical life and experience of the Church in judgment and resurrection, a pattern which already anticipates the final judgment and resurrection at the *Parousia* when the Fulness of the Church will be, and be revealed as, the Fulness of Christ Himself.

There can be no question about the fact that the authors of this document have deliberately based their teaching upon the Biblical witness and sincerely tried to follow its direction, but one would have liked to see them apply more thoroughly, as in the N.T., the eschatological perspective to their interpretation of the growth of the Church. A more deeply Biblical understanding at this point would go very far to solving many of the difficulties and tensions which they see in the history of the Church. The Church which is at once under judgment and risen again with Christ can only live her life by putting off the old man and putting on the new, by ever refusing to be conformed to the pattern of this world and through her participation in, and her conformity to, the death of Christ, by being renewed in the power of His resurrection. If we take with full candour and seriousness the teaching of the N.T. that the Church is the Body of Christ, then we can only think of the progress of the Church in history on the Christological analogy of the miraculous birth of a virgin, and in the death and resurrection of the Son of Man. The deepest difference between 'protestant' and 'catholic' theology in regard to the Church is to be found here, in the insistence that the Church, her life in the tensions of history, her growth toward Fulness, are to be understood exclusively in terms of Christology, while eschatology is simply a thoroughgoing application of Christology to history—history understood in terms of *ὁ Πρῶτος καὶ ὁ Ἔσχατος καὶ ὁ Ζῶν*.

The weakness of their doctrine of the growth of the Church comes out again in their account of justification and soteriology. The exposition of justification as the completely free restoration to fellowship with God is acceptable as far as it goes, though they clearly misapprehend the use of forensic terms in the theology of the Reformation, interpreting them legalistically rather than eschatologically. They are wholly right in rejecting a notion of righteousness as a static attribute and in grounding justification upon the saving activity of God, but here justification is set forth so entirely in terms of relationship as to make one wonder whether they have not missed the *substance* of justification. It is true that justification entails such a radical change in the sinner's relationship with God that his whole existence is involved, but they fail to grasp the point upon which Calvin laid such great stress, that the substance of justification is a *real and substantial union with Christ.* Justification has ontological content. They are right in rejecting with Calvin the Roman notion of an infusion of righteousness, for as Calvin saw such a notion was Christologically untenable and even heretical, because it entailed (contrary to Chalcedon) a confusion between the divine and human natures; but to state justification only in terms of a new relationship is to leave the doctrine very vague. Moreover, because they think of justification only in terms of relationship or fellowship with God, they think of sanctification only as the spontaneous response of man to the change which this relationship with God involves for the sinner, for it is so glorious, so astonishing, they say, that he cannot be unmoved by it. Cut out of justification its heart, our ingrafting into Christ or our union with Him, and this idea of sanctification becomes rather Pelagian. That is perhaps realised, for later on pains are taken to point out that 'our righteousness will never be our own achievement. It is the righteousness which we lay hold of by faith in Christ. We shall be like Him because His righteousness has been made our own.' But *how*? To that question no clear answer is given. So long as the doctrine of justification is left vague like this, there will always be room for 'catholic' misunderstanding and reaction against it.

It would appear that the answer of these Evangelical Anglicans is Lutheran at this point: *Der Glaube ist die Verneuerung*. The new relationship of faith is the new life. Calvin's answer was much profounder: faith is an empty vessel and the relationship of faith has no saving or regenerating significance in itself, but faith is the vessel which holds the living reality, union with Christ, which grows and increases, for 'Christ not only unites us to Himself by an undivided bond of fellowship but by a wondrous communion brings us daily into closer connexion, until He becomes altogether one with us' (*Inst.* 3.2.24). Thus Jesus Christ is not only the agent of our justification, but He is in Himself its whole substance—but Calvin is careful to point out that this means that in justification we are given a new human righteousness which is the righteous humanity of the risen Jesus. It is the whole dimension of the risen humanity of Christ, and of our actual participation in it, which is left out here when these theologians expound justification only in terms of a relationship between God and the forgiven sinner without the *tertium datur* of a new righteousness which cannot be understood only in terms of the mighty acts of God in vindication and deliverance, or in terms of a human response to that divine activity, but in terms of the concrete righteousness of the new Man, the *eschatos Adam*, who dwells in our heart by faith and whose Epiphany waits for the last day. In other words, what this document has left out of its purview is the N.T. emphasis that *Christ was raised* for our justification (cf. *Inst.* 3.25.3).

It is worth while studying carefully Calvin's exposition of this whole matter in the third book of the *Institutes*, and not least his actual procedure in that exposition. He begins with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and faith as union with Christ through the operation of the Spirit. But this union with Christ involves us in His death and resurrection, for we cannot become one with Him without participating in His death and resurrection, that is without mortification and regeneration. It is only after a long discussion of regeneration as an actualisation in the believer of the risen life of Christ, and as an anticipation in conditions of time of the final resurrection, that Calvin feels he can go on to discuss justification, for then he is in a position to show that justification entails all this at its heart and as its substance. Justification is thus expounded only in strictly Christological terms and on the analogy of Christ's death and resurrection. That is followed up at the end of the third book by two corollary doctrines, election and the last resurrection, which are doctrines emphasising the eternal foundation of our union with Christ and its future blessedness when its full reality will be revealed. Then in book four he goes on to expound the same teaching in terms of Baptism and Eucharist, for justification and baptismal incorporation into Christ are essentially counterparts, and sanctification and Holy Communion as our continuing and deepening union with Christ are essentially counterparts. As he who is sacramentally incorporated into the body of Christ is in Holy Communion continually nourished and maintained in the Body of Christ, so sanctification is the continual unfolding and maintaining of our justification. Sanctification is not a response of man that must be added to justification, but it is the continual renewing and re-enacting in the believer of a justification that is once and for all. The experience of sanctification is such an exercise in Word and Sacrament that the believer is ever being nourished with the new humanity of Christ, and being clothed with His new divine-human righteousness which is the fundamental reality of his Christian being. Apart from this whole doctrine of union with Christ and incorporation into His body, says Calvin, justification means nothing to us. It was because the theologians of Trent failed utterly to understand the Reformed teaching on Christology and our union with Christ that they spoke of the Reformed doctrine of justification as a legal fiction. The same failure is a marked characteristic of many Anglo-Catholics, and is not wanting in these pages either.

When we examine their doctrine of the Church, we find that these Anglican theologians have exercised a strange consistency, for quite in line with their omission of the substance of justification, they define the Church mainly in terms of the means of grace, rather than in terms of Christ Himself, that is, as His Body. To be sure the visible marks of the Church are the preaching of the Word and the right administration of the sacraments, along with true discipline, but the Church can never be defined in terms of its marks. Failing to get at the real heart of the Reformed doctrine here, they go on to misinterpet the distinction between invisible/visible in terms of inner/outer aspects of the Church which is certainly quite alien to the teaching of Calvin, for it gives the whole idea a foreign subjectivist bias, though it is in line with mystical ideas inherited from Roman Catholicism and German Pietism. If we begin again with the Church as the Body of Christ, and remember that Christ has removed Himself in Ascension visibly from history, and will be seen in like manner only when He comes again, then we have the key to Calvin's use of 'invisible', for as the Body of Christ the Church becomes an object of faith: *credo* (not *video*) *sanctam ecclesiam*, and faith is the evidence of things not seen. 'Invisible' thus stands for the ontological and eschatological reality of the Church which will be manifested only in its fulness at the *Parousia*, but which becomes sacramentally visible in the Church in history as often as she baptises her children and ever becomes in the holy Eucharist the Body of Christ.

It is to be remembered that the men who have written *The Fulness of Christ* go back to a tradition in the Church of England which has long stressed evangelical experience to the neglect of Church and sacraments. Though one notes in these pages a very welcome and for evangelical Anglicans a new coincidence of evangelical *experience* and the *sacramental event* within the Church and its corporate worship, their understanding of 'protestant' theology is still governed somewhat by their traditional outlook. On the other hand, Continental 'protestantism' has stressed overmuch the sacramental event and thought of evangelical experience too meagrely in terms of faith's acknowledgment of the objective work of Christ. Some *rapprochement* and interaction between these two emphases would be extremely healthy for both. However, had the authors of this document a more Reformed understanding of the Church and sacraments, their discussion of the resolution of the conflict between 'protestant' and 'catholic' teaching, would have been rather different. Again and again the Reformed theologian finds in these pages thrust into the 'catholic' side of the tension stresses and doctrines which he has been accustomed to hold as quite central and basic in his Reformed theology, so that the discussion particularly in the last chapter is to him rather baffling and even at cross-purposes. When he comes to the conclusion and reads the account of the six fundamental truths which any scheme of reunion between 'catholic' and 'protestant' would have to affirm, three from the 'protestant' emphases, and three from the 'catholic' emphases, he finds that he has always held five of them, and that his difference on the sixth, 'the historic episcopal ministry', has to do with a corporate rather than an individualistic understanding of the episcopate, not with the rejection of the episcopate as such. At first sight that looks as if there is a far closer kinship between Reformed and Catholic theology than these theologians, who have not come out of a Calvinist tradition, have ever realised; but in actual fact it means also that the tensions between 'protestant' and 'catholic' theology must be taken down to a much deeper level, than they envisage here, before any real approach can be made toward their resolution.

The whole drift and the major point of this document is clearly influenced by what is called 'The Anglican Experiment' in which 'catholic' and 'protestant' traditions appear not only to be in inevitable and necessary tension within the Church of England, but to be pointing a way ahead toward the resolution of this tension. This leads many Anglicans to feel that the Church of England can become the great *Via Media* in the ecumencial movement, and that indeed it is her divine calling in history to be just that. I believe that such an interpretation of the Anglican Experiment as is given in these pages, in the whole notion of unity in tension as the road toward the Church's Fulness in Christ, is a major contribution to ecumenical thought, of far greater significance than anything of this kind that has yet appeared, but a clear note of warning ought to be sounded. The Anglican Experiment has far greater significance and far greater possibilities within the Anglican Communion than it will ever have outside of it, for the issues between 'protestant' and 'catholic' theology are much profounder both in tension and kinship than those between Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals within the Church of England. Anglican comprehensiveness has always, in Elizabethan days, as in *Catholicity* or in *The Fulness of Christ* involved a somewhat superficial understanding of the theological issues and differences. Only a failure to understand the profounder elements of Lutheran and Reformed theology could encourage in Anglicans the hope that their intra-Anglican and indeed insular experiment of unity in tension could be effective between the great Churches of the West and the Eastern Church or the Church of Rome. The theology of Calvin, for example, was more catholic and more patristic, than anything in the history of the Church of England, and yet the differences between his theology and that of Rome go down to a deeper level than is generally understood in England. In these circumstances to push forward unduly the Church of England with her comprehensiveness as the *Via Media* may prove a greater obstacle than help in the whole ecumenical movement. Nevertheless, I believe that the Church of England, as interpreted through a document like *The Fulness of Christ*, has more to offer the ecumenical movement than ever before, while if her theology were deepened, she would have more to offer to our growth toward reunion than any other single Church.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Intercommunion—Report of a Theological Commission of Faith and Order. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

'EARLY in this conference these young people were disturbed by the need to hold two separate communion services. Most of them attended both Services—the Anglican and the Free Church. But those not belonging to the Anglican Communion were not invited to partake at that service and felt cut off. Anglican young people themselves were most deeply disturbed. Many discussion groups got down to this and tried to understand more fully why the Churches of Britain were thus divided at the Communion Service.'

The words quoted above are taken from a brief Report on the Bangor Youth Conference (August 1951) compiled for the Ecumenical News Bulletin of the British Council of Churches. They will serve as well as any to exemplify a situation which to those who are familiar with it causes acute sorrow and shame, and to those who come to know it for the first time almost incredulous astonishment and even indignation. The plain fact is that where Christians should be most at one, in the Communion of the body and blood of our Lord, there they are most separate, and the very token of their unity has become the symbol of discord and division. At no point do the words of Paul: 'Is Christ divided?' apply with more devastating and painful force. It is one of the most significant features of the Churches today that its diverse members not only feel the shame of the situation, but on all sides manifest a desire to investigate the possibility of resolving the scandal and mitigating its painful consequences.

It is safe to say that this publication of the World Council of Churches, by a Commission under the chairmanship of Professor Donald M. Baillie of St. Andrews, will from now on be indispensable in all discussion of this pitiable situation, at whatever level it be conducted, whether by laymen or clergy, by the leaders of the Churches or the rank and file of the congregations up and down this country.

The booklet is virtually impossible of summary: it is itself a masterly and lucid résumé of the whole extraordinarily complex situation. One is tempted to say simply: if you are concerned about this evident scandal in the life of the Christian Church, read this brief booklet from cover to cover.

The document is divided into eight sections. The first of these presents an explanation and apologia for failure to adhere exactly to the remit accorded to the Commission at its inception. It soon found it quite necessary to go beyond 'the collection and systematisation of the rules and customs actually prevalent in the various Churches'—and this for the reason that other work in the field had already sufficiently covered this ground. A task in fact more difficult, and one may well add more valuable, remained to be done: to penetrate 'beneath the rules and customs to the fundamental theological issues that are involved'. It is this more hazardous attempt that gives this publication a much more than transitory value and transmutes it into a genuine contribution to the question at issue.

The second section is an indispensable clarification of the required terminology. The section defies summary and must simply be read. But an important consideration already obtrudes itself. While from the point of view of (say) the Churches in this country, definition of terms is easy, the same definition is received with uneasiness by, for example, the Eastern Orthodox Church, for whom the proposed definition of intercommunion gives the whole conception an artificially and 'exclusively ecclesiological sense'. Here an ancient diversity between East and West rears its head, the distaste on the one hand, and on the other the desire, for specific definition. History leaves marks upon its subjects, and neither here nor elsewhere can it be gainsaid or ignored.

In the third section 'the nature of the problem' is expounded. 'The idea of *Churches* as denominations at variance with each other is not only absent, but utterly remote, from the New Testament.' Present day urgency is affirmed in familiar terms, and due mention is made of the fact that 'paradoxically this growth of the Ecumenical consciousness has led to a widespread revival of "confessional" or denominational consciousness, and a great many Christians have developed a new and much more live interest in the question: Why am I an Anglican? or why am I a Presbyterian?' and so on.

The penultimate section outlines three ways in which, at ecumenical gatherings, in face of the diverse attitudes of Churches and indeed of Christians in the matter, the celebration of the Communion may or can take place. Guidance of a useful practical kind is offered. The section, while doing nothing more to illumine the basic problem, is illustrative of its tragic character, as different expedients are devised, not to overcome the difficulties, but merely to mitigate their painful and shameful effects. The final section summarises agreements and disagreements.

It is, however, in the middle sections, that the crux of the

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

problem is laid bare and the doctrinal issues at stake are made apparent. Section four poses this question: Can Intercommunion precede Reunion?—and with this we are fairly precipitated into the midst of the fray. Here too different points of view immediately manifest themselves. There are those, especially in Anglo-Catholic and certain Lutheran circles, who hold that Intercommunion between separate denominations implies a 'disrespect for truth and indeed for the Sacrament itself'. There are others, however, especially among the 'Reformed' Churches, but also belonging to Anglican and English Free Churches, as well as to the Church of Scotland and other Churches of Presbyterian order, who hold that 'in the meantime the tragic situation is *less* tragic if we can have intercommunion with each other across denominational boundaries'. From this side too it is further averred, since the Communion is a means of grace and especially according to Lutheran doctrine a means of forgiveness, that Intercommunion is not only possible in the face of disunity, but necessary if this disunity is to be overcome. To prohibit intercommunion at this stage is like debarring an invalid from medicine because he is sick—it is to deprive the riven Church of healing and mending grace.

The real point here concerns the 'separateness' which is on the one side and on the other denied to be an insuperable obstacle to present Intercommunion. It is admitted on both sides that there is an immense area of common ground, a great common inheritance of Christian faith. More and more this has in recent years been realised, and much joint action has profitably followed its realisation. The separateness in question, which is regarded as prohibiting immediate Intercommunion, must be of such a kind as to render any coming together over or across it a mockery and subterfuge. In other words the separateness must be of a very fundamental order, and of great significance *at this point* at least. If, for example, the two sides were separated by a fundamental difference of opinion concerning the notion of the Communion, this would manifestly be a just reason for suspecting the legitimacy of precipitate attempts at Intercommunion. Whether this is in fact so is dealt with in the following section to which in a moment reference will be made.

Meantime, the converse of what has just been said is to be emphasised. It must not be any trivial difference that is alleged as ground for the impossibility of Intercommunion, nor any superficial or peripheral difference. I suppose it would be admitted on all hands that our Lord Himself is and remains the Lord of His own Table and Altar; and that its administration and the celebration of His Communion there is in some way and degree committed to His Church. No hard and fast line, of course, can be drawn between the office of Christ and the office of His Church, so that we might say: here one ends and the other begins. But if the Church in the discharge of its appointed office here is at any point to bar admission to an Altar and Table which is in the last resort not its own, but its Lord's, it must be very sure of the ground on which it takes its stand. It cannot lightly or readily transform the dominical injunction: Eat ye all, drink ye all, of it, into a discriminatory selectiveness: *You* may eat and drink of it, but *you* may not.

Resuming the argument as it was being developed before the above animadversion, a deeper level of consideration is reached in the fifth section which is entitled: Divergences of Sacramental Doctrine as a Barrier to Intercommunion. This is at least the *kind* of divergence, if it exists, that would prove a legitimate and invincible reason for discouraging present Intercommunion. This section therefore bravely faces the nature of ecclesiastical divergence at this point.

Two divergences appear here which are more relevant to the wider field of the World Council of Churches than to the narrower Church situation in this country. The Eastern Orthodox Church finds difficulty in abstracting the Holy Communion from a wider Koinonia embracing little if anything less than the whole life of the Church. Again, Lutheran and Reformed Churches on the Continent are at variance over the requirement made by the former for a particular doctrinal definition of the presence of Our Lord in the Communion ('in, with and under' the elements).

The divergence that most urgently refers to Churches in this country is that between different answers to the question: In what sense is the Holy Communion a Sacrifice? There are wise words spoken here, as this document declines either to minimise or to exaggerate the fundamental discrepancy at this point between individuals and Churches. It is certain that the word 'Sacrifice' can be so used as to cause discord and engender schism. Yet within this field there are certain extremes which if carefully defined would be held to be excluded by the great bulk of Churches subscribing to the World Council. Any definition of the Holy Communion in terms of a *repetition* of the Sacrifice of the Cross is at the one polar extreme; the other would be exemplified by the reduction of the Sacrament to a *mere symbolic memorial* feast.

Within this field, even so circumscribed, the occupiable positions are indefinitely if not infinitely numerous. Granted that the Communion is not a repetition of the Sacrifice of Christ, is it a *continuation* of His Sacrifice? or an *application* of it? or in what sense (excluding re-presentation) may it be said to be a *representation* of it?

Those who make up their mind for or against Intercommunion have to ask themselves very seriously whether within the limits roughly laid down it is justifiable to admit all Christians to celebrations of the Communion or necessary to debar certain of them. This is the manner in which the theological problem presents itself. But these lines carefully laid are crossed by a bewildering, mischievous, and almost freakish element. The fact of the existence of *interdenominational rapport* and of *intradenominational diversity* has to be recognised. There are those who at this point may with astonishment find themselves much more at one with many members of another denomination than they are with many of their own.

Out of this there emerges the most pointed and painful of questions for the members of all denominations. It is one which unless it can be justly answered simply bypasses even the theological divergences mentioned above. The question is: If such doctrinal divergence appears within one denomination, whose members are *ex hypothesi* in communion with one another, by what right do we erect it into a barrier across which members of different denominations may not meet at the Holy Table? There are of course a number of ready answers to the question of a practical and administrative kind. But it may well be asked whether any of them can be made out in terms of sufficient weight to make an adequate reply to the query posed.

The problem of Intercommunion is once more (as we may say) turning in the hands of those who busy themselves with it. It is not readily explicable in terms of priority or posteriority to complete union. Nor has it been found capable of statement on purely inherent theological terms. A third stage is reached, when as explanation of the situation the element of Orders is invoked. The sixth section deals with 'Differences of Orders as an Obstacle to Intercommunion', and the categorical statement is made that 'the lack of episcopal ordination in other Churches as at present constituted is regarded as a fundamental obstacle to intercommunion'.

It is neither possible nor desirable to enter here into this thorniest of all basic problems affecting the ecumenical situation. This is only one of the matters which after examination and with some surprise one sees to take its rise in a fundamental question of order. It is improbable that if difficulties really emanate from this source their solution will affect the basic disorder; and it may be that their solution is in fact impossible until this disorder is set right. But, in either case, it would be time wasted to deal directly with this inflamed and aggravated question of order. There is, however, a query which can and ought to be raised immediately. It is whether the matter of order can legitimately be allowed to exercise such influence at this point, that Christians for its sake come to take different sides on the matter of Intercommunion. The differentia mentioned above was 'episcopal ordination'. Looked at from below from the point of view of those young people with mention of whom this essay began, the differentia means that because some of their number were confirmed by a bishop, and others were variously confirmed (though not 'episcopally'), admitted or received into the full membership of the Church, they cannot together receive the Communion of the body and blood of their common Lord and Saviour. It is to be noted that the differentia here operative is not membership of the Christian Church. Admission to membership is by Baptism, a Sacrament, whether administered in infancy, adolescence, or old age, which is admittedly a dominical ordinance. Into this baptised membership of the Church, a differential is introduced, a discriminating factor, by which those who may, and those who may not, be admitted to the Holy Table are distinguished.

Reference must here be made to the fact already mentioned, that to the Church, though our Lord Himself retains lordship over His own institution, there is accorded also a genuine part in its administration. To this office of the Church then must belong the duty of discriminating within even the baptised membership of the Church between those who may and those who may not be admitted to Holy Communion. It would, for example, be generally agreed that flagrantly immoral conduct must be held to debar a member of the Church from participation, unless signs are evident of repentance and amendment. But a quite different order of discrimination is introduced if it be averred that everything depends upon admission to adult membership in the Church and the form which such admission takes.

Here both the Anglican Church and the Church of Scotland along with other reformed Churches are faced with awkward questions. The awkwardness arises from a certain imparity between the two foci of the discussion at this stage, Baptism and Confirmation. Baptism is on almost all sides regarded as dominical and the normal entry into real if not full membership of the Church. It is left for confirmation, with admittedly less dominical authority behind it, to act as arbiter who shall and who shall not within this real membership of the Body of Christ be permitted to approach His Altar.

The application of the question particular to the Anglican Church may be framed as follows: On what ground does it erect not only Confirmation, but a specific kind of Confirmation, into a *causa standi vel cadentis* for baptised members of the Christian Church? And can it justify this discrimination between the members of Christ's Body?

For the Church of Scotland, the question comes framed in other terms: On what ground does it interpose the requirement of 'years of discretion', 'profession of faith', confirmation, and so on from those whom by Baptism, Christ has made members of His Own Body? And if the brief answer be faith, at what point is faith to be so inserted into the matter that it breaks up the initial simplicity of the dominical invitation: Eat ye all, drink ye all of it?

It is of course not alleged here that these questions are unanswerable. It is no more than suggested that discussion which aimed at finding answers and formulated them would be one way of advancing the understanding of a question which so seriously perplexes the present day Church.

At all events, and whether this suggestion be right or wrong, it is incontestable that this Commission under Professor Baillie has put us all deeply in their debt, and laid us all under obligation to study and consider this booklet.

J. K. S. Reid

Where Science and Religion meet. By Laurence E. Browne. Religious Education Press. pp. 128. 6s.

Cross-roads of History. By William P. Cleland. Religious Education Press. pp. 96. 3s.

The Book of the Acts. By M. D. R. Willink. Religious Education Press. pp. 120. 3s.

Prophet Harris. By Margaret Murson. Religious Education Press. pp. 111. 3s.

What Worries Me. By Ronald Selby Wright. Epworth Press. pp. 117. 6s.

The Christian Offensive. By Hamish McIntosh. Church of Scotland Youth Committee. pp. 39. 1s.

Deuteronomy. By T. S. Crichton. Church of Scotland Youth Committee. pp. 57. 1s. 6d.

Ambassador for Christ. By William Barclay. Church of Scotland Youth Committee. pp. 171. 3s. 6d.

Let us hear the Word of God. By Effie R. Gray. Church of Scotland Youth Committee. pp. 109. 3s.

These books are addressed to young people or their teachers for their private or group study, from the pulpit or the lecturer's desk. In them we can feel the impact of some current theological movements on the younger generations of the Church. The reviews try to indicate their aims, especially their direction towards a settlement of old controversies and towards a surer grasp of the Bible.

The issue, for example, between Science and Religion 'has been bedevilled by controversy', but Professor Browne of Leeds University is one of an increasing number of men of understanding and good will, who try to get through the estrangement and to speak a language which is mutually intelligible. He argues that Science and Religion 'reveal to us two aspects of the same universe and that no satisfactory view of the universe can be got by confining one's attention to Science or Religion alone'. An often repeated claim is that 'each stage of the natural world offers a revelation of God akin to itself'. He rejects any static idea of Creation or of human nature 'as if God made man exactly as He intended him to be'. The governing word is Development, which is not mechnical and may be intermittent; there are signs of stagnation and of regress, as well as of progress. But, if we look to the best which has yet appeared, viz. in Christianity, we see such a rise as suggests the guiding Spirit of God in the past and for the future.

It is something of a jolt to the traditional language of theology to read that 'men such as Isaiah . . . are the mutations of human evolution', though mutations are actuated by God, or that 'the moment came when the moral separation of man from God was not so wide that it could not be bridged by a new mutation; thus, meeting man more than half way, God united Himself with one man, Jesus Christ'.

Surprisingly little is said about miracles, though their reality is claimed, and there is only a passing reference to prayer.

In an age, whose thinking is increasingly dominated by scientific categories, such a book demands the serious attention of preachers, who hope to make the gospel intelligible to the inquiring mind. The work of such 'translation' as Professor Browne attempts cannot be easy, but it is both necessary and hopeful. The ground of the old-fashioned materialist has been swept away and there are signs, as were noted in the recent meetings of the British Association, of a readiness to believe with Max Planck that 'Religion and Science fight in a common crusade'.

There is a constant demand for 'background material' to the Bible. Mr Cleland of Whitehill Secondary School, Glasgow, has written an interesting and lively account of Palestine, as it affects an understanding of the New Testament. Imperial and national politics, taxation, roads and travellers, intellectual influences, religious traditions and movements are reviewed in ten chapters with the help of as many maps and pictures. It is made clear throughout that the 'pathfinding' has an aim and that at 'the cross-roads of history' stands the Cross of Christ. At the end of each chapter are readings from Old and New Testament, which are now plainer after the exploration of the surrounding country.

A companion volume in the same 'Pathfinder Series' is a little commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. It is designed for middle form pupils and older scholars in Sunday Schools, to help them in their own searching of the Scriptures. While it is simple and does not profess to deal with 'questions of scholarship and criticism', there is no 'talking down'. Rather it does simple justice to the intelligence of boys and girls, who want at least the positive results of scholarship. Indeed the younger generation are here introduced to Codex Bezae, are shown the apologetic value of 'Luke's Journal' and trace with informed interest six stages of the Apostolic Church's growth. It is surely a sign of a new day when the modern school boy carries a commentary on Acts and one so fresh and direct as this.

Prophet Harris is the story of an African John the Baptist, whose preaching on the Ivory Coast met with an almost embarrassing response. It is written for children in their early 'teens, but it raises questions for the older reader such as the relation of moral reformation to instructed churchmanship, or of the possession of the Bible as a useful charm (unread) in Africa or Britain to its intelligent study and obedience.

Mr Wright dedicates *What Worries Me* to his choir boys, past and present. The first part consists of 'Fireside talks on the chief events of the Christian Year'; the second contains 52 'Sermon Snapshots', pages from longer sermons on themes such as Prayer, Miracles, Baptism, the Bible, Sunday, Friendship, Death, Courage. Again this writer does his boys the justice of believing that these great subjects are of interest to them; and, if the treatment is not profound, it is always interesting. There are some excellent stories, although the 'moral' is at times somewhat dragged in. It is a question whether the style, which sounds so well over the radio, looks so well in print. There is a sentence on p. 16 which runs to 15 lines, contains 8 dashes and records the words 'that's the smashing thing about Christmas'. The editing of the chapter on Miracles has left out something and the argument ends in what looks too like anticlimax. But the general impression is of a kindly, older friend speaking to his boys on the great themes and making a real effort to 'translate' into their language the answers to their worries.

The Christian Offensive is a study booklet for the age group found in Youth Fellowships prepared by the chaplain to Glasgow University. The warlike titles of the book and its seven chapters are perhaps misleading, for the tone throughout is calm and persuasive. In addition to the usual features of such outlines, Mr McIntosh adds project suggestions, leading to some kind of action—charts, surveys, visits, plays or an experiment towards a Fellowship which is more than a name. The list of books suggested offers some unusual and attractive titles. This is a workmanlike, straightforward course.

Direct, methodical study of one book of the Bible is an established feature of modern youth work and the Minister of Rothienorman offers guidance through the rich but often neglected wisdom of Deuteronomy. Given a group with even the mildest interest, this promises to be a first class course: it yields so much that is real and convincing even in a reviewer's reading that the actual class work can hardly be less worth while. Mr Crichton expresses his debt to Dr Driver and Professor Welch, but he has allowed the original to speak for itself directly to the modern situation. The total effect is one of utmost clarity and of being in the presence of something 'quick and powerful'.

Ambassador for Christ is so excellent that it deserves a more thorough review than is possible here. It is so full of good things that it may be doubted whether any Junior Bible Class, for which it is designated, could exhaust it in one session. It goes without saying that the scholarship is careful: unlike much scholarship, it is lively. It abounds in modern parallels, with really good quotations and credible stories, which not only make St. Paul a man of flesh and blood but stir imagination and conscience to his Gospel. The style is forceful and clear. Through the whole book there goes something more than usual of eagerness and warm conviction.

The sub-title is 'The Life and Teaching of St. Paul' and not the least remarkable chapters are the last four, where Mr Barclay explains to modern youth the apostle's thought of God and of man and how the just shall live by faith. It will be of real interest to learn what success leaders have in getting these chapters across. If the book is widely used, we may hope soon to have passed the complaint that the words in the Epistles are too big for the twentieth century. But it should be noted that Mr Barclay is at pains to set before the imagination of his class the source of the metaphors; so we have pictures from the Law Courts (Justification), from Friendship (Reconciliation), from the freed slave and history (Redemption), from the Temple (Propitiation), from the Accountant's Office (Imputation), the Family (Adoption).

In the full list of books, there are some simple but others are of the weight of Kirsopp Lake, Ramsay and Martin Dibelius. There is something here for every stage.

The very title of Miss Gray's studies, *Let us hear the Word of God*, is significant of a much needed change of mind towards the Bible in many parts of the Church. For too long it was the manner of some to treat the Bible as a corpse for dissection, of others as a test of orthodoxy. Miss Gray makes clear in three sentences what she does not mean by the title; but her great concern is that young people in Bible classes should not just be talked to but should by varied means find that God speaks to them through the Bible.

In 17 chapters the class is led towards this discovery. There is an introduction to the idea of the covenant; two studies are spent on God speaking through the prophets, single chapters on God speaking through Creation, through Worship, through the Church. But the main emphasis is on the God who speaks to us through His Son, Jesus Christ. The course ends with a summary, which is at the same time an invitation to decision and action. This book could not be placed in a series of ready-made helps, for it demands a considerable amount of work on the part of a leader. Each lesson consists of opening and closing Acts of Worship; an introduction, where the theme is related to the class; study of the Bible itself and some kind of handwork or activity, however simple. Everything is done 'to encourage and help the class to read the Bible regularly and to make it a guide in their lives'. Miss Gray forestalls criticism by pointing out that more material is given for each lesson than can be used in one hour. She does not claim to deal with all the books and themes of the Bible but rather to suggest methods by which interest may be roused, until attention becomes obedience.

What more could the *Scottish Journal of Theology* ask than such a book as this, which introduces young people, in so interesting and thorough a method, to the fundamentals of Covenant Theology, Worship, Eschatology and the Word of God? If more were asked, it might be found at the end where Miss Gray quotes the noble answer to the 90th Question in the Shorter Catechism, 'How is the Word to be read and heard, that it may become effectual to salvation?'

This is a demanding, rewarding book, the work of an alert and devout mind, itself deeply persuaded of the title and eager to bring others to the same conviction.

These little books for young people show some of the quickening winds which move through the Church in this often bewildering time. To feel such winds is a great refreshment.

A. G. Macalpine

Revue Biblique, Juillet 1950. Published by L'École Pratique d'Études Bibliques, Jerusalem.

This trimestrial, which is published by Dominicans in Jerusalem, deserves notice for the general excellence of the articles, and the attitude to Protestant scholarship of a scholarly Roman Catholic journal. The range of its subjects is very wide, covering a discussion of the curse on Jericho and a suggestion by R. de Vaux as to who put the Dead Sea MSS. in the cave where they were found. The chief article is the first half (fifty pages) of an essay on the literary structure and theological signification of Romans, by A. Feuillet.

After pointing to ch. 1.16, 17, for Paul's statement of his subject, Feuillet divides the first eight chapters into three parts, in each of which a portrayal of our misery precedes and gives force to an affirmation of our salvation by Christ: thus 1.18-3.20 precedes 3.21-5.11; 5.12-21, 6-7.6; 7.7-25, 8. In this very satisfactory scheme the latter parts do not develop the preceding, but advance to a deeper level. There is, however, a trinitarian unfolding: up to 5.11, God the Father is usually the subject of verbs; 5.8, 9 is a turning-point: now Christ appears constantly. From 7.7 the Spirit is mentioned twenty-two times.

Two literary forms are noted; the first is called ABA', and comprises (A) discussion of a subject, (B) discussion of a different one relevant to the theme, (A') return to the first subject with greater particularity. Rom. 1-8 (as here divided) is an example, within which five others are noted: but perhaps the form is best identified in 1 Cor. 8-11.1: meat offered to idols: (A) 8.1-13, (B) 9.1-10.13, (A') 10.14-11.1: or 1 Cor. 13: it is common in Paul's writings. The second form is a curious near-duplication, both of words and content: e.g. in ch. 7, cp. v. 14 with 18a, 15a-18b, 15b-19, 16.17-20 It is remarkable.

Among points made are these two. The epistle is not an apologetics showing that only Christianity satisfies our need, but an account of the mystery of the divine plan, given from the standpoint at which a Christian finds himself. Where we translate 'righteousness', the French read 'justice': so it is noticed that in O.T. the word often goes with 'salvation', and means God's will to prove faithful to his promises (as Rom. 3.21), and only secondly his judicial action in punishing breaches of the covenant.

The essay deserves the adjectives scholarly, evangelical, orthodox: once or twice the thought is foreign, perhaps unintelligible to a Protestant: but otherwise the ground is common, unless for all-pervading natural theology. Farewell to any ideas that Roman doctrine must shackle Roman scholarship. Augustine and Aquinas are disapproved, Kittel cited, Westcott and Hort preferred, Deutero-Isaiah considered, Protestant scholars quoted with approval, especially Cullmann. In this essay, there is no taking issue seriously with Protestantism: nevertheless, in such a journal the Protestan treader can learn the Roman position as their scholars teach and study it (not necessarily as priests proclaim, or laity understand it). And the first obvious fact is that they pay far more attention to Protestant scholarship than we to theirs. Hereby we deprive ourselves of great riches, and suffer for our unregarding pride. Among the book-reviews, well over a third concern Protestant works, including a translation of Hoskyns and Davies' *The Riddle of the New Testament*, which is treated entirely sympathetically. A reviewer of Barth speaks of Luther and Calvin as 'les Maîtres de la Réforme'. This is indeed proper, but we need to know that it is the case. In the long road to a reunited Church goes through the knowledge of our need of each other, here is witness that in this respect the Roman Catholic Church has the role of the son who said, 'I go not', and went.

S. R. MacKintosh

BOOKS RECEIVED

The following books have been received and are gratefully acknowledged

William Robinson: *Whither Theology?* 7s. 6d.
G. R. Beasley-Murray: *Christ is Alive.* 7s. 6d.
Auguste Lecerf: *An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics.* 25s.
—Lutterworth Press

Daniel-Rops: *Israel and the Ancient World.* 16s.
Charles Marston: *The Bible Comes Alive.* 8s. 6d.
—Eyre and Spottiswoode

Steiner and Scott: *Day by Day We Magnify Thee*—Meditations from Luther. 12s. 6d.
Edward W. Hirst: *Morality and God.* 6s.
Henry Carter: *The Methodist Heritage.* 15s.
—Epworth Press

M. G. Tucker: *John Neville Figgis.* 10s. 6d.
Joseph Woods: *Old Testament in the Church.* 9s. 6d.
S. M. Gibberd: *Tomorrow's Church.* 6s. 6d.
—S.P.C.K.

Charles Williams: *Descent of the Dove.* 15s. —Faber and Faber

Thomas H. Hughes: *The Atonement.* 5s. —Allen and Unwin

Brother Edward: *Behold Thy King Cometh.* 5s. —Canterbury Press

Wilhelm Stählin: *Vom Wagnis der Predigt*
Karl Friz: *Die Stimme der Ostkirche*
—Evangelisches Verlagswerk, Stuttgart

George Seaver: *Albert Schweitzer—a Vindication.* 6s. —James Clarke

Diana Leatham: *Celtic Sunrise.* 12s. 6d.
Edgar P. Dickie: *One Year's Talks to Children* (2nd imp.); *A Second Year's Talks to Children.* 6s. each.
—Hodder and Stoughton

Christian Youth Manuals, Vol. 1, edited by E. H. Hayes.
Phyllis Hall: *The Book Adventurous.* 4s. 6d.
—Religious Education Press

W. Scott Morton and Others: *Chart for Adventure—Methods of Bible Study.* 1s. 6d. —Church of Scotland

R. K. and M. I. R. Polkinghorne: *Message of the Kingdom.* 3s. 3d., 4s.; *Heroes of the Faith.* 3s. 9d., 4s. 6d. —University of London Press

THE SON OF MAN AND HISTORY

by The Rev. Professor W. MANSON

In an age like the present, when the good will to establish a reasonable order of international life on earth is beset at every turning by impediment and frustration, there exists a temptation, if not to think of history as irredeemable, at least to moderate considerably our confidence in the relevance of Christianity to mundane affairs. We should not be surprised to find an increased tendency to mysticism, or if the hold of external reality over the mind is too strong to permit such withdrawal of the soul into itself, a lapse may set in towards an apocalyptic judgment on history with a hardened sense of the opposition of God to the world. In evangelism the effect may be to give preference to the Home Mission task of the Church over its Foreign Mission and ecumenical commitments. Certainly a change has come over the face of things and over our own temperaments since the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910. There has been a screwing down of the lights. There has been a retractation of many hopes. In 1910 the Christian Churches stood on the tip-toe of missionary enthusiasm. The doors were swinging open in all lands to the entrance of the Christian Gospel. The day of the Son of Man was believed to have come near. Optimism with relation to history was of the order of the day. Today the world-scene has grown clouded and ambiguous.

But does the change *justify* a reduction of the Christian hope for history? Should the greater realism of our present world-outlook encourage a trend of mind which is negative to that hope? *Is there a New Testament philosophy of history, and, if so, what is it like?*

In proposing to treat of this question the writer regards it as not insignificant that numbers of men who, a few years ago, were disposed—partly under the influence of the prevailing direction of theological opinion—to be pessimistic and apocalyptically minded with regard to the world-outlook, have come to speak a different language, not because the facts of history have altered for the better, but because these persons have come to a maturer understanding of the character of the Gospel.

I

We find in the Gospels a series of words of Jesus which relate to the mission and destiny of the 'Son of Man', and which in style and character stand out in high relief from the mass of His recorded utterances. These sayings are *oracular* in tone in that their subject, the Son of Man, is introduced without explanation or mediation in the context. They are thematic in form and didactic in substance as laying down what the Son of Man is to do, to experience, or to be. They are kerygmatic in intention, revealing a design to bring together and to think together the calling of the Son of Man and His historical manifestation. In view of these features and the circumstance that in the Gospels the term 'Son of Man' occurs always and only on the lips of Jesus, the conclusion to be drawn is that these sayings, so far as their original form and text can be critically established, represent authentic revelation of our Lord Himself. Consequently it is not surprising that a modern German theologian should propose to take these utterances as *the* historical kernel of the gospel. 'Of the wrath of God,' writes Ethelbert Stauffer, 'of the kingdom of God, of the people of God, and of the eschatological Redeemer, the Baptist has already spoken. Jesus first speaks of the Son of Man and of His Way.'[1]

Whether or not Stauffer is right as regards his main contention, it is impossible not to agree that the Son of Man sayings have a place within the *penetralia* of the gospel revelation. Clement of Alexandria quotes a word of Jesus from a certain (probably a Hellenised) Gospel in which Jesus speaks of His 'mystery': *μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου.*[2] Whatever this *mystery* may have been, it cannot but have included in it the truths set forth in these sayings about the Son of Man. So that we may regard these words as clustered lights situated to left and to right, so to speak, of the chancel steps leading to the innermost shrine.

To left and to right! For these Son of Man sayings fall into two groups: first, a group which bear on His *humiliation*, which associate the fortunes of the Son of Man with the condition and experience of humanity, or bring Him into action or involvement in its tragedy:

---

[1] *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 10 ff.
[2] Cited in Huck's *Synopse*, p. 72.

> The Son of Man came eating and drinking.
> The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head.
> The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which is lost.
> The Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins.
> The Son of Man must suffer much . . . and be rejected . . . and slain.
> The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of men.
> The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life as a ransom for many.
> The Son of Man goeth as it is written of Him, etc.

In all the sayings of this class we have an *integration* of the Son of Man with the condition, necessity, contingency, pathos, shame, sorrow, and sin of human life in history. Over against these there is, secondly, the group of sayings which present the Son of Man in the *transcendence* and glory of His risen and victorious life. *Is this the same Son of Man?* By all the evidence of the Gospels and of the New Testament He *is* the same, though some critical expositors, unable to support the paradox of the position, have proposed on theoretical grounds to declare one or other of the two classes of sayings unauthentic. Examples of the second group are:

> The Son of Man must . . . rise again.
> The Son of Man shall rise again from the dead.
> They shall see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory.
> You shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.
> In an hour that you think not the Son of Man cometh.
> As the lightning . . . so shall the Son of Man be in His day.
> When the Son of Man shall come in His glory and all the angels with Him, etc.

Here we have the ultimate *sublimation* of the Son of Man in contrast with His earthly humiliation. But it is significant that *this transcendent regnant life of the Son of Man does not pass out of relation to, or cease to have meaning for, the terrestrial sphere of His historical manifestation.* Apart from the fact that the Son of Man has His adherents and followers here, whose 'way' on earth is to be conformed to His way, and whose norm of life is to be the example of Him who 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister', the glory of the Son of Man is to be made visible to 'this generation', and He is destined to 'come' again in history. In other words, the focal point from which the graph of this transcendent destiny of the Son of Man is described lies on the plane of this world's history.

Whereas in the Book of Daniel the figure depicted by the seer as having the likeness of a 'son of man' goes to the Ancient of Days to receive an everlasting dominion, *but does not return*,[1] in the New Testament revelation the Son of Man, the Lord from heaven, comes back to the world, bringing His kingdom with Him.

> Though now ascended up on high,
> He bends on earth a brother's eye;
> Partaker of the human name,
> He knows the frailty of our frame.

The line which runs from His suffering to His glory does not in the New Testament presentation lift from the plane of the world's history and soar eternally into the blue, but curves back again to that history, and meantime enfolds that history, remains in touch with that history, and finds its completion in that history. *The recession towards eternity of the movement which begins in the Incarnation does not cut out the earth, or by-pass its process, but takes the world and history up into itself.* As St. Paul's teaching puts it, Christ 'must reign till He has put all His enemies under His feet.' Surely at this point the New Testament teaching has something to say to us with regard to our present world besetment and predicament!

II

From these two classes of Son of Man sayings there start the two great engagements of Christian thought within the mind of the New Testament Church. These are *the Parousia-hope* and *the Church's sense of mission to the world.* It was the apocalyptic determination of mind that first asserted itself not only at Jerusalem but at other centres of Christian evangelism, such as Thessalonica. The question 'Lord, is it Thy will at this time to restore the kingdom to Israel?' was asked before the intimation came from the risen Lord of the Church's mission to the world, and from the record of the Book of Acts it would appear that the latter engagement first came to clearness in the consciousness of the followers of Stephen.

---

[1] Dan. 7.13 ff.

The present writer has elsewhere dealt with the part played by St. Stephen in this remarkable evolution, and the story need not be repeated here.[1] At the heart of the evolution was the immediate presence to Stephen's mind of the Son of Man as already at the right hand of God. To this enthroned Jesus Stephen commits his spirit. For this man, on whose lips alone after Jesus the name 'Son of Man' appears, Judaism with its law and its cultus was a thing of the past. What dominates his world, regnant over history like the Morning Star in the sky, is the *Christus Victor*, the Lord Jesus, to whom the whole world and the whole future now belong. What would be Stephen's *gospel* as, with Israel and its institutions dropping behind him into the past, he faces towards the glory of the Son of Man and the dawn of a new day? What but this: 'Because He lives, we shall live also'? To this Son of Man Stephen commits his spirit. Life, salvation, shapes itself now as Christ-grounded and Christ-enfolded. Undoubtedly by its circumstances Christianity would now, if not before this point, be thrown on mysticism, on a dependence upon the invisible world such as Judaism under the law had never known, on life 'hid with Christ in God'. Yet not on mysticism pure and simple, rather on *historical mysticism.* The law and the prophets were ended, but the Son of Man had been 'made under the law'. He had 'risen out of Judah'. The salvation which He offered was 'of the Jews'. The Christian Saviour was not a bolt from the blue like Marcion's Saviour, nor was His God like Marcion's God. There comes, therefore, a solidifying of Christian thought and theology around the historical significance of the Redeemer.

For one thing, He is now preached as '*the light of the nations*'. This expression had been used of the Servant of the Lord in Second Isaiah, and it was later taken over for the apocalyptic Son of Man in the First Book of Enoch. Now it serves to assert the world-significance of the Jesus whose dominion as the Son of Man embraces all nations, peoples, and tongues. He is preached as '*the Wisdom of God*', as '*the Logos*', the historical expression and instrument of the activity and the mind of God in creation and history as well as redemption. He is the answer of God to a world which in its Jewish sector has asked for signs and in its Greek sector has sought for wisdom. He is proclaimed as God's response to both sectors and in relation to both demands. He is the sign of the omnipotence of God and He is God's paradoxical yet real provision for man's demand of rationality. Judaism had looked for a Messiah and at Alexandria it had pondered the significance of divine wisdom in the cosmos and in *Heilsgeschichte*. But Judaism had not, so far as I can see, fused the conceptions of the Messiah and the Wisdom of God. On the other hand, in the literature of the Christian world-mission the identification is complete.[1] It is present in St. Paul's Letters, it is present in Hebrews, it is present in the Johannine Gospel and First Epistle. The Son of Man as Wisdom of God and Word of God stands organically related in all these writings to the world and to human history. The only explanation that can be offered is that the crystallisation of ideas in question arose spontaneously within Christianity at the very beginning of the world-mission. While neither St. Paul nor the writer to the Hebrews expressly designates Jesus Christ as the 'Son of Man', His image and idea are present in the Pauline Second Adam, the Man from heaven, the One who laid aside His glory to assume our nature. Equally they are present in the Man of the Eighth Psalm to whom, as the writer to the Hebrews sees, universal dominion is given. In the Johannine theology the Son of Man is expressly named. He is the One who has descended from heaven, the Logos who has become flesh. And the supreme point in every representation is that He who came to claim dominion in our nature is regnant now in history and shall come again in glory.

---

[1] See the writer's *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1951), pp. 25-46.

III

He who came to claim dominion in our nature is regnant now in history and shall come again in glory!

It is in the light of this supreme New Testament confidence that we have now, as we revert to our primary question, to orient ourselves to the world-situation today, and to consider our attitude to the world-mission task of the Church. How very different is *this Christian mystery of the Son of Man* from an apocalypticism which sways away from history, which conceives the

---

[1] See the writer's *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 93-97.

Church as merely an Ark on the water-floods, which regards Christians as brands plucked from a world-burning! In the Jewish 'Similitudes of Enoch' we find a Son of Man, the representative of the people of God, who is a lay-figure. He is exalted perhaps and glorious, but he is not a redeemer. He does not stoop to earth, nor integrate himself with history. He bears no sins or sorrows. He lays no transforming law of love on a reclaimed humanity. He merely waits in heaven to receive an elect who come to him at the end of days when he shall reign among them. It is another mystery altogether which is unfolded to us in the gospel. It is *the mystery of a transfigured apocalyptic which takes history up into its process, which indeed apocalyptises history*. It presents the fulfilment of the Son of Man in history, the taking of man into Christ, the sublimation of the human process by the 'recapitulation' of it in the Redeemer. The resulting substance is *the Body of Christ on earth*, a body formed in humanity by the indwelling Redeemer. While the vision of the *final* glory of the Son of Man continues to soar overhead, it is never in essential Christian thought dissociated from the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth.

The New Testament says that this Son of Man 'shall come in like manner as you have seen Him go'. How, then, did He go? By what process did He fulfil the mission which was written of Him? The New Testament answers by saying: 'This is He who came by water and blood; not by water only, but by water and blood', in other words by baptism and by crucifixion. If, then, His going and His coming are to be 'in like manner', it is plain that *the Parousia, whatever it may signify in its eternal dimension, is not to be understood in separation from the Incarnation and from Calvary*. It is not discontinuous with the latter but is their consummation. And there is a peculiar proof of this in the New Testament. While the star of the Parousia-hope burns above history, it stands always directly over the Church, and it keeps moving forward as the world-mission of the Church advances. The Second Advent *is never allowed to become identified with any contingency in contemporary events, however earth-shaking and portentous these may be*. Apostles and evangelists say: 'Not yet the end!' 'First must the gospel be published among all nations!'

The successors of Stephen and the other early leaders of Christianity, who went out with their passionate proclamation of the Second Advent, could not find in any contemporaneous happenings the sign of its fulfilment. In this they differed from the mass of Christians who, once and again, when persecution came upon them, or later when Judea went down before the Roman legions, were sure that the End had arrived. How do we explain this singular fact that, despite everything that happened in these first generations, despite even the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the expectation of the Parousia is put off and off by the responsible leaders of the Christian Church? It was not that the alleged outward signs of the End were not sufficiently *critical*. What could be more critical, in an external point of view, than the Neronian persecution at Rome and the desolation of the Holy City? Yet a strange constraint lay on the Apostles not to accept these events as final. Something existed at the heart of Christianity which resisted any too near an expectation of the End. Nor in the light of the considerations which have been before us in this study is the nature of the restraint difficult to recognise. *The Saviour had laid hold on history to claim it for Himself.* And the Church had its world-mission which it must pursue to the last issues.

For example, when the Thessalonian Christians, fed by St. Paul on hopes of the near Parousia, leapt to the conclusion, the moment that persecution swooped upon them, that the predicted end of the world had arrived, St. Paul entreats them, for the sake of the real Parousia-hope, not to give way to the excited idea, whencesoever derived, whether from 'spirit, or word, or alleged letter from himself', that 'the day of the Lord had set in'. He tells them that much must happen before that time, and meantime he asks them to *go on with their work.* He saw that apocalypticism threatened to paralyse the life of the Church and its mission to the world, and he had his answer ready.[1]

So also in the Gospel of Mark, chapter 13, the evangelist, writing after the Neronian persecution of the Church and before the Fall of Jerusalem, dwells with unusual fulness on the tradition existing in the Church with regard to our Lord's predictions of His Parousia, and underscores certain features. The readers are warned against premature reports that the Lord has come. There will be wars and rumours of wars, but 'the

---

[1] 2 Thess. 2.1-12, 15-17.

End is not yet!' There will be secular upheavals and commotions, but 'these things are (but) the beginnings of the throes' through which the Messianic age is born. There will be persecutions, for 'the gospel must be published to all the nations', but 'it is he who stands firm to the end who will be saved'. Even the Hand which shows itself in the profanation of the Holy Place at Jerusalem and in the intolerable sufferings which will follow, even that Hand of judgment is not to be interpreted as writing *Finis* to history, for only afterwards, and beyond these events, will the Son of Man appear.[1]

According to the New Testament consciousness, therefore, the sign of the Parousia lies beyond any world-events which can be imagined! Nevertheless it stands right over the path of the Christian mission to the world. The Son of Man has chosen the integration of Himself with sinful men as the way to His glory. This 'Not yet the End!' of the world-evangelism of the Christian Church is the thing in the New Testament religion which *leaves the door of hope open to history* as the province of the Divine working and of the Divine design of salvation. The line which links Bethlehem with the Second Advent runs through history, not overhead of it. History comes into eschatological estimation and determination.

The mysticism which flees history and the pseudo-apocalypticism which looks askance at it are equally excluded from the New Testament point of view. The apocalyptic attitude which leans away from history represents not a Christian, but a sub-Christian determination of mind. But let us remember that the Christian disposition to wait quietly and hopefully for the salvation of the Lord must take account not only of the word of Christ to mankind but on the character of its *preachers*. These are to see by the Son of Man Himself what manner of men they are to be:

> as unknown, and yet well known;
> as dying, and, behold, we live;
> as chastened, and not killed;
> as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing;
> as poor, yet making many rich;
> as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.[2]

The apostles and ministers of Christ are to integrate themselves with humanity. Their way is the way of the Son of Man who goeth and also cometh as it is written of Him.

---

[1] Mark 13.1-27.

[2] 2 Cor. 6.9-10.

A few years ago a young missionary returning to India after his first furlough set down for the rest of us the thoughts which were in his mind. It is the stage when one is no longer sailing for the first time over blue seas to a new enchanting land, or drifting up romantic rivers through a rapturous mist of jungle and rice-fields, but when all that is over, and the man is face to face with the facts, the poverty and apathy and hopelessness of depressed millions, and the pride and prejudice of the higher orders, and when one has the task of making the love of God in Christ real under such conditions. What shall one do then? And little by little he shows us how the missionary has to learn patience and lowliness and sacrifice, all of the order of self-extinction, until in the end he has nothing behind him but the Crucified. India has had enough of systems and doctrines and ideologies. If the love of Christ is to be made real and to have an impact on society, it must be by becoming incarnate in His representatives. They are 'crucified with Christ', and it is no longer they who live, but Christ liveth in them.

But then this missionary, who has told us of the difficulties of the work, turns over a leaf, and tells us that Christ is coming in India. He sees visibly the signs of His coming. Just as of old the message came, 'Go, tell His disciples and Peter that He goes before you into Galilee. There shall you see Him', so now it speaks of India. There, in the old days, were the Apostles, and when Jesus died upon the cross, all their *pre-conceived* ideas perished with Him, nailed to the cross. And then, when they had nothing of their self-assertion left, when the stage had been swept clear of all this, He lifted His hands upon them, and said: 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations . . . and, lo, I am with you all the time, even to the end of the world.'

MAKING CHRISTIANS BY SACRAMENTS

BAPTISM AND FIRST COMMUNION IN A SECULARISED ENVIRONMENT

by NILS JOHANSSON[1]

I

THE description 'making Christians by sacraments'[2] which has sometimes been employed by leading Baptist circles in Sweden has indeed almost become a catchword, intended to be used against the larger churches and to set the stamp of low worth upon them. Above all it is meant as a rebuke because of the way in which they receive their members. The term is undeniably most fitting and, in more than one respect, significant. The churches have always gone on the presupposition, and with more or less insistence stressed the fact, that their members become Christians by means of a sacrament, i.e. baptism. They are confirmed in the Church's fellowship by means of another, i.e. the Lord's Supper. The churches cannot defend themselves against the accusation that the term 'making Christians by sacraments' implies by trying to explain away or lessen the significance of the sacraments nor have they any wish to do so. Such a defence would involve nothing less than a denial of the facts. Without the least embarrassment, however, the churches can defend themselves by maintaining that the practice described as 'making Christians by sacraments' is the only one which corresponds to the attitude of Jesus and the Early Church towards the nature of the Christian fellowship and that only where it is practised can the real nature of the Christian Gospel be fully indicated. As soon as we allow man's religious or ethical qualifications to be decisive in the case of the religious fellowship or in receiving new members into it, the Christian Gospel is eliminated and an element from another religion is imported.

---

[1] Translation by Rev. V. C. Pogue, B.D., Orphir, Orkney, of Chapter vi of *Biblens Värld och Vår* (abbreviated at points indicated), appearing here by kind permission of the author and publisher.

[2] It is rather difficult to render this description neatly in English. It is one word 'Sakramentskristningen' in Swedish. The same idea is contained in the word 'christening' in English but it has only reference to baptism whereas this word refers to both Sacraments. (Tr.)

It is exegetical study, especially in the last two decades, that makes it so easy for the churches to maintain their position in this respect. The so-called 'New Testament view' of the Christian fellowship, which is fundamental in the theological outlook of the sects and separatist bodies and which they do their best to realise, at one time passed as true beyond any discussion. The New Testament view of the fellowship was then seen, as has been set forth in a previous chapter[1] to be constituted in this way, that a group of believers in Christ banded themselves together to form a sort of body and that in turn a church was constituted when these bodies afterwards came together to form a greater unity. At a relatively early time, so opinion ran, the Church began to depart from this New Testament view of the fellowship. One of the clearest marks of this departure was the role that the making of Christians by sacrament came to play, especially when infant baptism was generally adopted in the second century. At the stage when that conception was accepted, even within the churches, as historically correct an effort at defence was made by warning of the dangers of Biblicism. The structure of Church fellowship was said to be governed by the prevailing historical conditions. At a later date, so the argument ran, we could not be bound by the conception of the fellowship in the New Testament. Behind such reasoning lay the attitude that questions about the religious fellowship in the Early Church were altogether peripheral; in no way did they concern the central facts of the Christian faith. That in the third article the Church is an object of faith was a fact that strangely enough was easily let slip within the great evangelical churches.

But the situation, as hinted before, has altered quickly. Exegetical study and the reconsideration of the articles of the Christian faith which has gone intimately along with it has shown clearly how nearly related is the problem of the nature of the Gospel with the problem of the being of the Church fellowship. The one simply cannot be treated without taking the other into consideration. This article sets out to show

---

[1] Op. cit. p. 94. (Tr.)

how much the two problems belong together, that in reality it is only a question of one problem. . . . Research has shown that what was earlier taken to be the New Testament view of the fellowship is just a construction which was invented at a later date and is without real support in the sources. . . .

II

Exegetical study today seems to have attained far-reaching agreement about the important role that the sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, played in the Early Church. In this, as in many other matters, it has confirmed the findings of the Religious-historical school as over against the older Liberal school which relegated them to a very peripheral place. But on questions like the origin of the sacraments it differs considerably from the conception which is put forward by critics such as Reitzenstein, Heitmuller or Bousset. The argument that sacraments are in essence foreign to Judaism and that therefore they must have been the same for Jesus of Nazareth and the Palestinian Church has been shown to be incorrect. The same can be said for the argument, which has long been almost a maxim, that wished to establish that Paul and John, under extra-Christian influence, altered the sacraments to something entirely different from what they had been originally.

We scarcely make ourselves guilty of exaggeration if we aver that we can say with reasonable certainty what Baptism and the Lord's Supper were and what they meant in the Early Church. However meagre the information in our sources may be so far as the first mentioned sacrament is concerned, especially about the place of baptism in the earthly life of Jesus, we can maintain that the Epistles of Paul presuppose Baptism as an established institution in the Christian community. What Baptism meant for Paul emerges clearly from his Epistles. It is by means of Baptism that a man becomes a Christian. When he is baptised he is made a member of Christ's Body and finds real fellowship with him in his death and in his life. Expression is by no means given to Paul's conception of Baptism if it is averred that in that sacrament he sees only a ceremony, a picture or a parable. In Baptism something really happens to a man. That Paul presupposes his conception of Baptism even in such communities as he did not found can be seen in e.g. Rom. 6.3-4: 'Or are ye ignorant that all who were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death? We were buried with him through baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we might walk in newness of life.'[1] No other conception of Baptism than that which comes to view in this place is, in fact, to be found in the Early Church, so far as we can judge from the sources we have.

So far as the Lord's Supper is concerned our sources are somewhat less meagre than in the question of Baptism. The content and meaning of this sacrament, as we have seen in the preceding chapter[2] are better understood as soon as it is clearly realised that it had its origin not just in what Jesus did with the bread and wine on the night in which He was betrayed. The celebration of the Lord's Supper has a direct connexion with the meals which Jesus had with the publicans and sinners and with His disciples or with men in general during His ministry. What that implies becomes clear to us as we realise what the fellowship of a meal meant in Israel. The celebration of the Lord's Supper was an eating and drinking in God's kingdom, at one and the same time a beginning of, and a prophecy concerning, the Messianic meal. It widened and deepened the fellowship in Christ created by baptism. It was one of the means by which the risen Lord bound His chosen to Himself in a more intimate fellowship.

III

With steadfast insistence the Christian Gospel maintains that redemption takes place not through man's own work but through God's grace in Christ. This is a fact that stands so much in the centre of the witness of the New Testament that it is only very seldom that anyone dares to challenge it seriously. Jesus did not come to call the righteous but sinners (Mark 2.17). Herein lies the distinction between Christianity and Judaism. The dispute between the Pharisees and Jesus, seen at its deepest, is not a dispute between a pretended and a real goodness, between hypocrisy and sincerity, but a dispute between the Jewish religion of law and the Gospel religion of grace. The conceptions of reconciliation in these two religions are so different, indeed so absolutely opposed, that no compromise or understanding is possible. . . . [The section omitted here deals with Paul's treatment of the Judaising elements in Galatia.]

---

[1] All quotations from the Bible are from the English Revised Version. (Tr.)
[2] Op. cit. pp. 93-121. (Tr.)

IV

A direct consequence of this characteristic of the Gospel is that the Church fellowship cannot be created by anything but the prevenient grace of God, by nothing else than God's election. The Christian fellowship, the Church, is, as seen by the Early Church, the Body of Christ. Even if that term is only met with in the Pauline Epistles the conceptions that lie behind it are basically the same in the whole Early Church. The Messiah can never be separated from His people, from the Messianic fellowship. Both constitute an organic unity, the nature of which is set forth in similes from organic life, e.g. the body or the vine. . . . Just as little as a branch can come into existence and grow unless through the vine, as little can the life of the Christian arise and develop apart from the Church. Therefore every condition laid down by man for, and every hindrance set up by man against, entrance into the fellowship becomes a condition of, and a hindrance to, reconciliation. As soon as anyone sets up certain religious or ethical qualifications or accomplishments as a condition for reception into the fellowship of the Church at that moment he has made the possibility of reconciliation dependent on these qualifications or accomplishments instead of allowing all to depend on God's grace in Christ. A portion of the religion of law has invaded the religon of grace and begun its concurrence with it. A hindrance to sharing in the fellowship immediately and inevitably becomes a hindrance to God's redeeming grace. . . . [Reasons for setting up qualifications have been generally pure but none the less wrong.]

Even from the very first days of the Church the religion of law has sought to make a place for itself in the Gospel. This was already the case among the disciples; the Synoptic parables indicate that. A few of them in particular, the Parables of the Tares and the Dragnet, allow us to see how among the first disciples Jesus had to fight against easily understandable efforts to make a compromise between the Gospel and the religion we have mentioned.

To understand the meaning of the parable of Jesus in Matt. 13.24-30 it is necessary to visualise the opposition which He must have awakened by His radical preaching of grace. It shocked men's natural feeling of justice, just as much as the religion of law satisfied it. It could not be right that a lazy idler who had worked only an hour, and that only the evening hour when it was cool and beautiful in the vineyard, should receive the full day's wage. If one received the full day's wage so easily why should anyone endure the burden and heat of the day? To what consequences might not the action of the householder give rise? Must it not encourage indolence and slackness?

The paradox of grace which rewarded equally all the workers in the vineyard took another form, alike unacceptable and repugnant—from a human point of view—by not laying down any conditions for entry into the kingdom of heaven or—what is the same thing—the Messianic community. Certainly the earliest disciples were surprised and annoyed at the motley crowd of men the Master received. It must have disturbed them that the boundaries of the kingdom were so elastic that not even the sharpest eye could perceive them. Did they indeed exist at all? One could possibly get accustomed to the thought that the Lord had now and then in His wrath destroyed a righteous man but that He, in the kingdom of heaven or the Messianic community, should mix up and unite evil and good, enthusiastic disciples who for the sake of the Son of Man had left all and wholly, or almost wholly, indifferent folk who, for example, only used the name of Jesus as a formula of exorcism to drive out the evil spirits, was more offensive. Even those who stood apart from all that Jesus stood for, they who saw in His work nothing more than folly and seduction, shared in the annoyance of the disciples. The Pharisees, who had not the slightest interest in the purity of Jesus' circle expressed their displeasure: 'This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them' (Luke 15.2). We experience this in our own time too. Enemies of Christendom, deeply suspicious of all religion, take offence at the lack of spiritual purity shown therein that the Church offers redemption so absurdly easily. It is against such criticisms that the Parable of the Tares is directed. It is striking that Jesus speaks in a parable. Thereby He makes known that the question about the boundaries between the Messianic community and those outside it cannot be answered by judging according to what is self-evident or suggests itself to man. The question is a part of the kingdom of heaven's mystery which can only be sensed by those who have ears to hear. But for him who understands the mystery the labourers who asked the householder's permission to pluck out the tares from the wheat, so that it might be clean even before the harvest, are the disciples who in the present, with human presuppositions and on a human basis, want to make a purge of the Messianic community. The householder forbade it.

. . . The noteworthy fact that the parable is intended to emphasise is that the tares come forth among the good corn in this field which was sowed with good seed. That both the parable and the interpretation in vv. 36-43 refer to the Messianic community, the Church, with its mixture of good and evil, so difficult to understand and so offensive to many, there is no real basis to dispute. And where the Messianic fellowship is present there too is the kingdom of heaven. The former is one of the manifestations of the latter in this time. That both good and evil will be found in the kingdom of heaven until the judgment is also clearly presupposed in v. 41: 'The Son of Man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity.' The children of the evil one who are mentioned in v. 38 are those who are seized by the call in time and receive a part in the kingdom of heaven, but who fail of redemption when the last day comes. . . . [Quotation from Theodor Zahn, Parable of the Dragnet. Neither parable expounded is a community creation.]

The Messianic fellowship had only one thing that marked it off from those without: in contrast to the latter all its members, *whether conscious of it or not*, had been reached by God's prevenient grace. It is not surprising then that its boundaries remain so difficult to demarcate for human eyes. They were not marked off by any confession of Christ. Not even the Twelve had reached that point before they had belonged to the circle of the disciples for some time. Nor were they marked off by any revolutionary inner conversion which led to an entirely altered way of life. A great number of the circle of the disciples seem to have come and gone. The account of the man who in Jesus' name drove out evil spirits (Mark 9.38-40) is a proof that one might share in the power of the kingdom of heaven without any outward sign of discipleship. . . . [Jesus' saying 'Judge not' is to be interpreted in this light.]

V

In Jesus' earthly lifetime it was His personal call, in its different forms, which was the condition of membership in the Messianic circle. This call He made by word, by His mighty acts, and by the fellowship of meals. As has been hinted before, the sources throw very little light on what role baptism played in this respect. Apart from the report of His own baptism we have only the short passages in John 3.22 and 4.1 f to provide information. It is here said that Jesus baptised, though it was not He Himself but His disciples who did it. What value as sources of history may be ascribed to these passages it is hard to decide.

Even if we must content ourselves with a *non liquet* in the question of the place of Baptism in Jesus' activity in calling men, we may, all the same, say that after His death it took over the role that His personal call had played before. It seems generally to have followed immediately after people heard and were seized by the missionary preaching. According to Acts 2.41 a great number were baptised after Peter's sermon on the first Pentecost. Saul received Baptism three days after he met the Lord (Acts 9.18). There is not a trace of a catechumenate in the New Testament. Nowhere at all is there mention of a longer or shorter period of instruction in the main points of the Church's faith preceding Baptism. That confession of Jesus as Lord was not made a condition of Baptism is proved by Paul's words in 1 Cor. 12.3, where that confession is described as a work of the Spirit. As the Spirit usually followed as a gift after Baptism (cf. e.g. Acts 2.38) confession cannot have preceded that.

The above-mentioned Pauline statement in 1 Cor. 12.3: 'No man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema; and no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit', must now be more fully considered. How can the Apostle allege that confession of Christ is one of the charismata which the Spirit works in the fellowship? Does not willingness to receive Baptism after hearing a missionary sermon imply a decision of such a sort that it must be compared with a confession of Christ? For an understanding of what the Apostle says in this matter we must make clear to ourselves that a change of religion in antiquity, and above all in the days of Syncretism, did not involve a conversion in the sense in which we use the word. One entered into the fellowship of a new god by being initiated into his mysteries or in some other way without feeling any need for a personal conversion and without demanding any information as to who the new god really was or what his mysteries really involved. The last was indeed a secret from the uninitiated. So far as the Christian mystery was concerned insight into it was the goal towards which the Christians strove and never the starting point of their lives as Christians. What the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians writes to his Christian brethren certainly provides illumination on the attitude of the whole Early Church to the question of the relation of the Christian to the mystery: '(and my prayer is) that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.' It was only when a catechumenate was started that it could be said with complete justification that confession of Christ became a condition of adult Baptism.

From the fact that a man, according to the Christian gospel, is not justified by works of his own but through God's grace in Christ it follows with necessity that a man does not become a member of the Church on the basis of any qualifications that he must first possess but through God's prevenient grace. That situation implies that infant Baptism must, from the point of view of the Gospel, be the most legitimate of all methods by which the Church receives its members. 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein' (Mark 10.15). Certainly infant Baptism has been practised since the time of the Early Church. That the question concerning the Church and Baptism was decided in the Church even before our earliest Gospel was written, that is about forty years after the death of Jesus, we may regard as more than likely in view of the report in Mark 10.13-16. The saying of Jesus that children belong to the kingdom of heaven can scarcely have been interpreted otherwise in the Early Church than that they, as much as adults, have a right to be members of the Messianic fellowship. If they did not have that right they could not belong to the kingdom of heaven. Nor is there the least trace in the New Testament of the thought that anyone can be received into the fellowship in any other way than by Baptism. Only if Mark 10.13-16 is understood as a defence to Baptism can the meaning and significance of that passage be explained.

At the same time Mark 10.13-16 also shows that even in the days of the Early Church the right of a child to belong to the fellowship was challenged. That such is the case is not a matter for surprise. The religion of law, as already emphasised, even from the first days of the Church fought for a footing in the territory of the Gospel.

That a man, even in Apostolic times, had himself baptised 'and all his house', that is his wife, children, and servants, just as Abraham once had himself and all his house circumcised, was without doubt a practice generally taken for granted. That it was an immediate consequence of the Christian Gospel and the nature of the Christian Church was not perhaps immediately realised. But a man had himself and all his house baptised for this reason that such was fully in line with the understanding he had of the nature of the family. The family formed, as antiquity and especially the Jews saw the matter, an organic whole, most of all in its religious side. As Oscar Cullman recently emphasised, in close agreement with Joachim Jeremias, it was the custom when heathen people went over to Judaism for their children to receive proselyte baptism at the same time. On the contrary such children as were born after their parents went over did not need to be baptised. They were treated, that is to say, as sanctified through their parents, a fact which has great significance for our question because of the analogy which it has in what Paul says in 1 Cor. 7.14. . . . We may say with certainty that a later Baptism at an adult age of these Christian children is, on the basis of this passage, totally excluded. . . .

It is, accordingly, a fact and not something more or less probable that making Christians by sacraments is the method of making Christians of Apostolic times. It cannot, therefore, be dispensed with or put on the one side on the grounds that it is not Biblical. He who dispenses with making Christians by sacraments in favour of making Christians through ethical or religious qualifications is not building, however much it may be averred that such is the case, on God's grace alone. He is laying a foundation of man's works in addition as a basis for redemption. He has fallen into a temptation against which Jesus and early Christendom gave warning more than against any other.

VI

As has been indicated above, Baptism implies, according to the Pauline conception and, for that matter, according to the agreed conception of the Early Church, that a man is made a member of the Body of Christ and finds real fellowship with Him in His death, resurrection, and life. It implies that one is born anew as a child of God with all the rights and privileges of a child of God. . . . The most important presupposition for an understanding of the thoughts of the Early Church on the significance of Baptism for man is that God is trustworthy and that therefore He treats the sacraments that He instituted in His Church through Christ seriously and works through them. Quite seriously, because we rely on God's trustworthiness, we venture to maintain that a baptised person, at all times and in all circumstances, stands in a different relation to God from the unbaptised. That does not, of course, exclude the possibility that God's prevenient grace may reach a man in other ways than by Baptism. To deny that would indeed be absurd. But he whom Christ once takes in His arms and treats as His child He counts as such afterwards whether He has joy or sorrow in him who has been baptised. . . .

If the New Testament attitude to Baptism is taken seriously it must carry important consequences with it in more than one respect. It must make a very serious impression on the Church's preaching and teaching about man's call, enlightenment, and sanctification. It is not Saul converted to Christianity by his experience on the Damascus road who is the type of the baptised person in his fall and restoration, but the prodigal son in Jesus' parable. . . . [Comment is here made upon the exclusiveness of the church-going group-like attitude of the elder brother.]

From what has been said above it emerges that the boundary between the group of Christians that remain at home and the group that go away from it cannot be drawn by anyone, though attempts to do so have been made all down the Church's history. It has been believed possible to separate between Christians in name and real Christians, between converted and unconverted, and to divide up Church members into two sharply distinguishable groups. . . . They who have attempted to make such a distinction, or have succeeded in doing so, have always used criteria, in drawing the boundary line, that are taken from another religion than the Gospel. In general all such attempts at delimitation are to be compared with the attempts of the servants to remove the tares from the wheat even before the harvest. This the householder forbade.

An important consequence of the New Testament view of baptism is that all baptised persons must be regarded and treated as fellow-Christians. Every preacher must be on his guard against speaking to those who only come now and again to hear him with the words of the elder brother. It is the father in the parable whose ways are to determine the content and tone of the message.

VII

. . . A man does not, under all circumstances, for time and eternity, possess redemption because he has been baptised. The grace of Baptism can be lost. Although a man in his lifetime has been a member of the Church and thereby possessed all the benefits and privileges of a child of God he may one day find the heavenly door closed to him. This possibility is pressed home in the many words of Jesus that we have, e.g. Luke 13.26-27. . . .

But it is not enough to say that the grace of Baptism can be seen some time after death to be lost. Of Baptism the same is true as of the call that Jesus made in His lifetime. According to early Christian belief it could not be without effect. If it did not lead to redemption it brought judgment. . . . (Matt. 10. 14-15; 11.21 (Luke 10.13); John 15.22-24). . . . These words of Jesus link up with a conception, documented in the Old Testament, that every divine message that does not evoke a response brings a hardening and judgment. To have been confronted with the call of Jesus in one way or another and afterwards to have neglected it brings judgment.

The same responsibility and judgment must be the portion of him who was received into the Church by Baptism and afterwards wholly neglected to avail himself of the grace of Baptism. The responsibility of a baptised person must be greater than that of an unbaptised person. From this fact arises the Church's inconceivable responsibility for those who by Baptism have been received into her fellowship. Is it surprising that many individual members of the Church, especially now in a very secular time and in a very secularised *milieu*, ask with concern, 'Can we continue to baptise children if the process of secularisation continues?'

The answer to this question should be clear from what has been said above. Were we to give a negative reply to it we should deny one of the basic truths of the Christian Gospel. So long as there is a Christian fellowship among us—and there will certainly be one so long as there are men, however small the Christian community may come to be—so long will infant Baptism be the most legitimate form of reception of new members into Christ's Church. And in spite of all the secularisation that has taken place, and may take place, the Church has enough possibilities left to practise the care and training of baptised Christians that are her duty. The correctness of this observation, which has intentionally been stated somewhat categorically, may be seen from a survey of the witness of the history of the Church. If consideration be given to the circumstances of the Church such as they are in this country and in many others it may be said without doubt that the possibilities open to the Church for caring for baptised children are definitely more favourable than they generally were in the Early Church, e.g. in the second century. Certainly there was less secularisation than with us at present, if by that word is meant indifference and irreligion, but the religions fighting against the Church were a much more significant force. . . .

That the Church at any time could abandon infant Baptism as a principle because of secularisation is entirely unthinkable. If she were to do that because of the increased responsibility that being baptised entails for a man, about which we have spoken above, she would then have as good reason to cease teaching and preaching. As has been said above, the Gospel is never without effect, however it may reach a man and however he may react to it. As soon as its message reaches him his relation to God is other than it was before. He has received more of its grace but at the same time has a great responsibility laid on him. He has either come nearer reconciliation or brought on himself a more severe condemnation. By Christ's coming to the world humanity has not just been given the possibility of redemption but also a new and greater responsibility. But that fact can in no way constitute a pretence for our isolating men from contact with the Gospel.

The only result of an increased secularisation for the practice of making Christians by sacraments is that it forces the Church to seek out what are, to some extent, new ways when it is a question of fulfilling her duty to the baptised. Her problem becomes how she is to find such new ways and walk in them. That many of those in which she formerly trod are impassable is obvious. Christian instruction in schools, the value and significance of which can scarcely be over-rated, is perhaps about to disappear gradually. The same applies to many Church organisations and institutions. When we inquire about paths that can never be blocked in any way by secularisation we must seize upon something entirely different. In *En Bok om Kyrkan Bo* Giertz employs a vivid picture of the invisible hands that grope for the baptised person who has gone away like a lost son. 'The first are his own conscience, which has received so thorough instruction and so strong an impression in youth that it knows that this is sin and wrong. Next comes the brotherly care of souls on the part of others and their continual reminder by word and example. Last of all are the silent prayers of the fellowship.' So long as there are Christian men on earth these unseen hands will not grow numb even if they may be influenced, and in some ways hindered by, secularisation. Thanks to them and what they accomplish the Church need never leave her baptised children to their fate. . . .

VIII

It belongs to the Church's care of baptised Christians that she helps them forward to First Communion. Even this piece of work has come under debate in connexion with the traces of increased secularisation. It has been asked if it is justifiable from a Christian point of view to allow children to share in a celebration of the Lord's Supper that in by far the most cases will be both their first and their last and to which they cannot have been drawn by any obvious inner desire. The answer to the question depends to a great extent on the answer to the question what the Lord's Supper and its celebration really are and what conditions can be laid down for participation in it.

The isolation and exclusiveness of Christians in relation to other men, without as well as within the fellowship itself, which are characterised as an invasion by the religion of law of the territory of the Gospel have scarcely made themselves so evident, in any other realm as in that of the Lord's Supper. The bitter complaints of the Pharisees and Scribes against Jesus that He received sinners and ate with them have their direct sequel in the demand of later times for a 'pure' communion roll. A great many of the complaints about the first communions of young people that are now common look for and find an echo in the mode of thought conditioned by the same legalistic religiosity as that which we meet in the complaint, 'This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them'. The more we keep our eyes open for the central place that the Lord's Supper took in Jesus' activity from the very first, the clearer it becomes that it was not just a meal for a little group of committed and sanctified disciples. Jesus in His earthly life took a meal, that is a Lord's Supper, with publicans and sinners and with a crowd of people by the Sea of Galilee who certainly had not, for the most part, a very deep insight into His mystery. He ate with His disciples long before they had received the revelation of who He was. From the last meal He did not exclude the disciple whom He knew to be a traitor. The fellowship of meals was for Jesus in His earthly lifetime both a means of leading men into the kingdom of heaven and of knitting more securely the bonds between His disciples and Himself. . . .

When these facts become clear it should not be difficult to see the justice, from the point of view of the Gospel, of a child's first coming to the Lord's Supper. Indeed if the consequences of the Gospel are followed out it may perhaps be asked if instruction for confirmation and confirmation itself must be made conditions for the participation of the young in the fellowship of the Church in the Lord's Supper. From out of the content and meaning of the Lord's Supper this condition is certainly not necessary. According to the New Testament, Christ never made stricter conditions for His meeting with a man in the Holy Supper than He made for His meeting with him in the word or prayer. He who ate with publicans and sinners, and did not exclude the traitor from the last meal, did not set up any conditions at all. But another reason can be put forward which provides justification for generally letting children wait before participating in the Lord's Supper until they have attained a certain knowledge and ripeness. To let them wait cannot be motivated by the feeling that Christ demands certain qualifications in those whom He meets in His Supper but may well be motivated by the feeling that He now demands a certain knowledge on the part of the person so that he may be able to understand, if ever so little, its meaning and significance. As was shown in detail in the preceding chapter[1] the situation in the days of the Early Church was completely different. Its meaning and significance were then as self-evident as that of the Word or prayer. But the self-evident presuppositions on which the Lord's Supper of the Early Church was based are, in large measure, no longer self-evident for the man of today.

---

[1] Op. cit. pp. 93-121.

THE WORD OF GOD AS KEY TO CHRISTIAN WORSHIP[1]

by THE REV. DR. PETER KATZ

I. THE WORD OF GOD

IN a service of the right kind God speaks to the congregation, and the Holy Spirit opens the hearts and lips of the congregation to reply. The means by which the inscrutable God comes out of the 'Light unapproachable' is His 'Word'. It has been the will of God to limit His self-revelation to mediation through the 'Word'. This self-revealing 'Word' makes itself known in two ways:

Firstly, God became man in Christ. He has thus entered our field of vision. From Christ's words and acts and from His character discernible behind them, the Father's nature, heart and will towards us are discerned, so far as such discernment is given to man. Christ is that aspect of God which is turned towards us. He reflects the rays of God, so far as human eyes can bear their light. As making known God's heart and will, Christ is therefore in a special sense 'God's Word'. To describe Christ as the Word of God is to give a fully adequate picture. It is as the Eternal Word of God that the Risen Lord is in the midst of His faithful.

---

[1] The following reflections took shape in 1947, at the Clarens meeting of the Commission on Ways of Worship which, in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order to be held in Lund, in 1952, had the task of surveying the existing forms of Christian services, and trying to find out the extent to which they were mutually reconcilable or not, in view of eventual re-union. At this preparatory stage it became obvious that it was not sufficient to compare even the truest descriptions of denominational usages, because it is not the forms but the convictions behind them which matter in the making of decisions about Christian unity. These convictions should not be merely tacitly understood, but unfolded fully. For this purpose a set of theses was offered with intention to present the basic convictions behind the Lutheran way of worship. Here nothing could serve the purpose but an uncompromising attitude, such as to provoke similar statements from other denominations and tendencies. The author never imagined that all would unite on what he was offering. But it was his hope that common attention might be directed to the dogmatic essentials, and away from the outward expression of these. As the final report of the Commission to the Lund Conference indicates, this hope has not been frustrated. In what follows the original draft of the theses has been altered very little.

Secondly, we have the message about Christ, as deposited in the Holy Scriptures, the primary document, which are as such *norma normans* for faith. In order that this Word of God, which has come down out of the past, may become God's Word in the present, a fresh element must enter in, viz. the 'Word', formerly spoken and kept for us by the Church in the Bible, must be brought home to us. This is the work of God the Holy Spirit. The Spirit who does the work of 'discerning the spirits', at the same time brings together those things that were previously separated; the barriers between time and eternity are removed where He reigns; there past, present, and eschatological future are seen as one. So the Spirit speaks a Word from the Scriptures to the present time and makes of it a word of instruction and comfort for the present congregation. Whether in the individual instance such instruction expressed through human lips is really God's Word, depends on whether the Spirit brings the treasure out of the Lord's storehouse ('He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you'—John 16.14). The Spirit works this miracle by causing an old Scripture truth to pass through a praying, living heart of today and making it a sermon relevant to the congregation of today. ('So belief cometh of preaching and preaching by the word of Christ' is Luther's translation of Rom. 10.17. He correctly interprets ἀκοή.)

II. Sermon and Sacrament

This 'preaching' as the means of the self-revelation of God takes two forms. One of these forms is the Service of the Word. In this proclamation the words of Scripture, which serve as a text, are brought to new birth by the Holy Spirit. Here the preached word is authoritative in so far as the preacher is able to show that his ideas and suggestions flow from the original meaning of the text. For, far from addressing the congregation on his own authority, he depends upon the power of the Holy Spirit who enables him to heal their afflictions of the day and to give them directions for the future from the treasury of the Lord.

The other form is the Sacramental Service of (Holy Baptism and) the Lord's Supper. Here is the same assurance of divine blessing (instruction and comfort) as in the Preaching Service. Here too God the Holy Spirit is the administrator and mediator, but here instead of mere speech He also uses the act instituted by Christ. These Sacramental Services, which are performed in obedience to Christ's command, are actions which speak to the senses. Not the act in itself, however, but the promise of the Lord made clear by it is the central point of the Sacrament. just as in the celebration of high Christian festivals the particular part of the Saviour's life celebrated—Annunciation, Birth, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost—will be made to reveal its intrinsic deepest significance to the congregation only by stressing the Word of Promise connected with it and constituting it: 'Fear not' at Christmas, 'become sin for our sakes' on Good Friday, 'I live and ye also shall live' at Easter, etc.

In the Sacrament, which is 'Word' and Sermon, one aspect of the self-revelation of God in the Word through the Spirit stands out more clearly than in the Sermon; namely the identity of situation by which the celebrating congregation is connected both backwards with the first disciples and forwards with the whole company of the Redeemed. In Holy Baptism it is the miracle of adoption, freely, by sheer grace and not of works, now as in the past and in all eternity. Likewise in the Lord's Supper, with us, with the Church in Jerusalem and in heaven, it is the admission of those who have no contribution to offer, not even that of a full understanding, to the Table of the Lord, who gives everything, even body and blood, and through our lack of understanding is driven into the heaviest suffering of loneliness.

As soon as we understand that in the Sermon as in the Sacrament God Himself calls and asks of the congregation nothing else than that they should hear and accept the call, we recognise both forms of God's self-revelation as of equal standing in the Church's worship. Of the *Sermon* we learn that it is God's medium, through which He makes Himself known to the Church and guides and instructs her as a whole as well as her various individual members. Of the *Sacrament* we learn that behind the moving action there stands the same self-revelation of the Triune God as Creator, Redeemer, and Comforter. In Sermon and Sacrament there occurs in different forms the selfsame thing. Emerging from inscrutability God becomes flesh and so becomes part of the stuff of human history which thus, turned into the 'history of salvation', moves towards God's eternity.

Only when the sacramental character of God's communication of Himself in the Sermon is lost sight of, a feature which is rather common in our days, is it possible to attribute to the Sacrament a rank above the Sermon. In the same way the appropriate valuation of the Sacrament suffers from failure to realise that by nature it is 'Word' in that it is *kerugma* (proclamation), a manifestation of God's heart and will, instead of being the mere following of a sacred tradition. A correct insight into the ultimate identity of both forms of celebration will make impossible as far as the Sermon is concerned the confusion of human talk with God's Word, and as far as the Sacrament is concerned, the detachment of the ceremony from the Word upholding it. In the first case there will be an end to rationalism, in the second to the performance of the mere ceremonial act, a temptation for High Churchmanship.

Neither Sermon nor Sacrament is a spontaneous or arbitrary form of expression on the part of the congregation, but the celebration of God's self-revelation as ordered by Him. They cannot be understood in isolation, but only as ordered stages in the history of salvation. It is by the command and gift of the Holy Spirit that the Word is brought home to every generation, and it is by Christ's institution, without which they would lack the foundation in the Word and thus their place in the history of salvation, that the Sacraments are distinguished and limited in number.

III. SACRAMENTS AND SACRAMENTALIA

This conception of Divine Service is that of the Reformers. It had been buried under covering layers of misconceptions which the Reformers had to remove: The first is the *sacramentalia* which overlaid the Sacraments. There are no sacred things which can take God's place for us and no ceremonies through which we can force God's hand. For the holiness of God is of its very nature strictly personal and can be communicated to persons only. The second is the perversion of the true Divine Service, in which God alone is the subject and the gathered congregation receive gifts from His fulness, into the type which in principle is pre-Christian, in which the priest is the subject and brings his own offering and that of the congregation, thus taking God into his service and laying Him under an obligation.

These two forms of service are opposed to each other. One is characterised by faith and thankful acceptance on the part of the Christian, and the other by lack of faith and by fear on the part of the pagans, who are necessarily driven into action through which they hope to force their will upon God. God is stronger than we are. For faith that draws on the abundance of God's gifts that fact is glad tidings. For what we have called lack of faith, namely, the attitude which ascribes to human action, especially in worship, a determining influence upon the relationship to God and upon God Himself, it is shocking to have to recognise the superiority of God. To overcome this superiority and to reverse this balance of power is the hidden meaning and purpose of theurgic forms and ceremonies.

IV. 'Sacrifice' and 'Priest'

For that conception of Divine Service which is rejected by the Reformers, the complexes of ideas centring round the terms 'Sacrifice' and 'Priest' are so significant that they cannot be given up. Following the ideas of the Reformers we come to regard both as constituent parts of the ceremonial law abrogated by the new covenant.

The constant temptation to allow to pass as 'also Christian' the fundamentally pagan way of sacrificial worship is unmasked as soon as we recognise that the 'sacrifice of praise' which is 'the fruit of the lips' (Heb. 13.15) is a mere form of speech. Such a figurative use of words occurs whenever a new insight into the relationship with God is expressed in terms belonging to a stage we have left behind. To sacrifice means giving away something of our own which we deny ourselves. Certainly we share with the Giver the treasures given to us by God, as children do with their parents, but that must not hide from us the fact that we have nothing of our own to give. All that the thankful congregation can offer is a glad response to the call from above. This relationship however is reversed, where the initiative of decisive action is seen to lie with the worshipping congregation, therefore to come from the human side. And such a reversal leads of necessity to a complete falsification of our relationship to God.

Just as 'Sacrifice' in the New Testament Church is a figure of speech which looks back to the Old Covenant and to the

Cross, so 'Priest' also is a conception which since the ending of the Old Covenant and since the sacrifice once for all on the Cross can be used only figuratively in the response of the congregation.

We must still guard against the possible misunderstanding that we consider the conceptions 'Sacrifice' and 'Priest' to have dropped out under the New Covenant. They are 'abrogated as constituent parts' only 'of the ceremonial law'. That is only to say that there is no longer in the New Covenant any sacrificial or priestly action—they are the same thing—on the part of the congregation. Such action would be a reflection of Old Testament action, which through Christ's High Priestly sacrifice has once for all been replaced and brought to perfection. In worship therefore the high conceptions of sacrifice and the priesthood, which cannot be given up, live on, but not in the 'sacrificial' sense that the congregation is led by a priest who sacrifices—which in Roman and High Church doctrine has led to attempts at explanation always difficult and never satisfactory—but in the sense that both ideas live on although detached from the celebrating congregation. Even in the pre-Christian period they had been understandable and tolerable only as a 'foreshadowing of Christ'. When in the Reformers' type of Divine Service everything points to the central fact that God in Christ gives us of His fulness, then the gift of God is focused in Christ *the* Sacrifice and *the* Priest. When we now speak of 'Sacrifice' and 'Priesthood', it is no longer a toilsome human effort always doubtfully successful, but the proclamation of God's inexpressibly great gift in Christ which awakens in us worshipping wonder and humble and thankful gladness. The proclamation by Word and Sacrament, God's own call, unfolds the abundance of His gifts: that fills the Service and leaves to the initiative of the congregation only scope for the *response* of spiritual surrender and consent. Thus 'Sacrifice' and 'Priesthood' no longer stand for human action. They have returned to Him with whom alone they have a right to be at home, to God, the Father of Jesus Christ.

V. The Word as Medium for Communion with God

The Reformers thought it of the first importance to emphasise the fact that God addresses us only 'through mediation', 'through the Word'. No more than John 16 do they mean to declare new insights into the nature of God to be impossible. They require only that new experiences of God shall remain within the framework of the history of salvation, that the God whom we meet and who reveals Himself to us be the 'Father of Jesus Christ', the eternal 'Word of God' and at the same time the One to whom the Word testifies. In other words they ask that God should find us within the congregation of His people.

Where the ideal of 'immediate' contact with God is emphasised, there might be the error of thinking that mediation denotes something derived or secondary. If this is to make sense it can but mean that the fullest intensity of experience is found only in completely spontaneous contacts. But what matters is not being out for experiences but being gripped by God. God wants to draw us into the continuity of the history guided by His Holy Spirit, into what is fundamental for the life of the world, viz. the history of salvation, and to give us our place there and meaning for our life. The man hungry for impressive experiences prefers isolation, not always consciously, like Nietzsche, who, it must not be forgotten, suffered under self-chosen isolation.

Where men think that they 'experience' God 'immediately', without the mediation of the Word, there may be various factors at the root of their thinking.

More than once—in Germany since the pre-classic literature movement of *Sturm und Drang* (Storm and Stress), about 1770—consciously or unconsciously, the phraseology of religious speech has been usurped in order to express particular intensity in the sphere of secular thought. Secular speech has thus been intensified without ceasing to be secular or making a transition into the religious, i.e. Christian sphere.[1] This is connected with the fact that the poets of that period, such as Herder and Goethe, had passed, though only in part consciously and intentionally, from the world of faith into the world of the secular mind. That is quite obvious with Fichte and Hegel, whose whole systems signify a transposition of the Christian into the idealistic, autonomous. With Hitler and his spokesmen, the abuse of Christian language becomes vulgar, cynical, and repulsive.

---

[1] An innocent parallel is offered by the late J. L. Garvin. Whenever he wished to set into relief the highlights of his articles he took to the Bible—not only to the particular colour of the AV language, but to actual Bible quotations. In doing this he hardly ever retained their original setting, but applied them to whatever he might be discussing. In the Biography which was published soon after Garvin's death the same device is applied to describing his own activities. But elsewhere in British journalism it seems to die out.

In many instances it was simply changing sensation which took the place of being deeply stirred. The starting-point of sensation is an It—the starting-point of being deeply stirred is He, God. A feeling of uplift becomes a substitute for religion, and such a sensuous spirituality no longer attaches any value to a continuity that is founded on the all-comprising action of the Spirit and rooted in the super-individual realm of consciences. That which has taken the place of God is thoughtlessly called 'Nature'. The religious world has been left for the aesthetic, whose values are considered the only and highest values.

For those who think that they are able to experience God outside the sphere of the Word there is at the best the reflection of a previous communion with God. The God whom Nature reflects for us may have been known to us before and we take Him with us into the surrounding Nature which otherwise would present an essentially different picture.

It is difficult to make sharp distinctions between these varieties. Aesthetic uplift may have something in common with creature feeling, and the latter is religious and in some circumstances even Christian. In contact essentially aesthetic, Christian heritage can play its part, even with men in whose conscious thinking God has no place. On the other hand the Psalms show that a powerful God-consciousness recognises the Creator everywhere in Creation—the Creator whom the devout soul already knows from living experience, before going out into Nature. How far the thought of the Creator, who at the same time is the Redeemer and Comforter, is concomitant or predominant, is the decisive point in judging these border-line cases. In one case a spectacle is enjoyed; in another a compelling call is heard. In the first case the experience is nonmediated, and therefore from the Christian point of view illegitimate; in the other it is a 'Sermon'.

Many suggestions for the reform of worship during the last generation in Germany are already doomed for us today because they spring from the world of immediacy, of self-willed fabrication. I think of the setting up of artificial symbols, which are brought from outside into our Preaching and Sacramental Services and can better nothing, even if betterment were needed. Most of them stand no repetition—the worst doom! There is much that is artificial and forced in some forms of youth services where 'works' instead of Grace is put into the foreground ('The only thing that a man can honourably vow is that he will never bite off his own nose'—Luther). Other proposed reforms, like that of the sacramental silence of Rudolf Otto, have a very strong theurgic colour or reflect impressionism pure and simple. Arbitrarily subjective, as also objective forms based purely on the *opus operatum*, fall equally far below the high level of Divine Service as the administration and reception of God's Grace. They all fail to realise that in true Christian worship the *living* God is the supreme Lord who draws us into His Service by imparting His Eternal Word.

CONFIRMATION

by The Rev. H. W. TURNER

I. Confirmation in the Reformed Church

(*a*) *The Reformation*

The second of the seven sacraments of the medieval church, confirmation, consisted of anointing with oil and signing with the sign of the cross, and was restricted to the episcopacy. The Reformers rejected this sacramental confirmation, on the grounds that in this form there was no scriptural warrant for it, nor was there any gospel promise attached to it. Likewise they were opposed to a rite that by its restriction to the episcopacy had come to be known as 'the bishoping'.

At the same time the Reformers desired to retain confirmation in what they regarded as a more primitive and scriptural form. This was to consist of two elements: first catechising and profession of faith, and secondly benediction by the imposition of the hands of the presbyter who conducted the rite. Thus Calvin refers to a '. . . catechising by which those in boyhood, or immediately beyond it, would give an account of their faith in the face of the Church. And the best method . . . would be, if a form were drawn up for this purpose . . . '. And again he says: 'This laying on of hands which is done simply by way of benediction, I commend, and would like to see it restored to its pure use in the present day.'

Luther speaks of the imposition of hands in very similar terms, and Bucer and Melanchthon refer to both these elements in the rite. But there seems to be no great clarity on the matter, especially as to what exactly was the content of this benediction. Their hopes for the institution of such a rite seem to have come to very little in the next few centuries.

(*b*) *Scottish Presbyterianism*

The antipathy to medieval symbolism and episcopal rites seems hardly adequate to account for the neglect and indifference shown by Scottish Presbyterians in the next three hundred years.

The *First Book of Discipline*, 1561, speaks of the necessity of catechising before admission to communion. Knox's *Book of Common Order*, 1556, and the *Westminster Directory*, 1645, have nothing to say at all in this connexion. In 1706 there is an isolated Act passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland prescribing a renewal of the baptismal covenant before admission to the Lord's Table.

In the second edition of *Euchologion*, 1869, we find the first attempt to carry out the ideas of the sixteenth century Reformers. There is a general and historical note on confirmation by Dr Sprott, and a 'Form and Order for the Admission of Catechumens'. In later editions this title becomes 'The Order for the Admission of Catechumens to the Confirmation of Baptismal Vows, and to the Participation of the Lord's Supper'. The rite consists of a confirmation of vows and profession of faith, an act of admission, followed by a benediction, preferably through imposition of hands, and otherwise through the usual elevation. The 1874 edition of *Euchologion* marks the first appearance of the term 'Confirmation', although as we shall see it was not yet used in its historic sense.

The *Directory and Forms for Public Worship*, 1909, emanating from the United Free Church of Scotland, contains an order for the 'Admission of Baptised Persons to the Full Communion of the Church'. This consists of a profession of faith, and act of admission with the right hand of fellowship, but has no actual confirmation of baptismal vows. The *Book of Common Order*, 1928, an official book of the United Free Church, has a service for 'Admission to Full Communion' which follows the 1909 form.

Prayers for Divine Service, 1923, is the first authorised order of the Church of Scotland in modern times, and follows the *Euchologion*. It contains a service for 'Confirmation of Baptismal Vows and Admission to the Lord's Supper'. At least two overseas Presbyterian Churches have similar orders containing these two elements, namely the South African and Australian Presbyterian Churches in their 1921 books of order.

This indicates that by the 1930's various branches of Scottish Presbyterianism had recovered something akin to the ancient confirmation rite, although it still consists of only two elements: the candidate's confirmation of his own baptism, and the judicial act of admission to the Lord's Table. The central act, of God's confirmation of the candidate through the Holy Spirit, is still missing. At the same time there are various indications that this central element is gradually being recognised again. The *Euchologion* restores the imposition of hands without being quite clear as to what is involved, and so leaves it as a kind of addendum to the rite. The South African Order contains a prayer which suggests true confirmation, i.e. of the candidate by the Holy Spirit. And the Australian Book actually borrows the confirmation prayer of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, and inserts it as an alternative prayer towards the end of a rite that does not contain an act of confirmation in this central sense. The Presbyterian liturgical tradition certainly seems thoroughly confused in this whole matter.

The first clarification seems to have occurred in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., which published its *Book of Common Worship* in 1908 as a supplement to the *Westminster Directory*. This book contains an order for 'Confirmation of Baptismal Vows and Reception of the Lord's Supper'. The first element is the profession of faith and confirmation of vows. Then strangely enough there is no act of formal admission to the Lord's Table at all, in spite of the title of the rite, but instead we find an act of confirmation and laying on of hands using the same formula as the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. This is the earliest Presbyterian confirmation rite I have been able to find. A certain caution accompanying it seems to be indicated by the appended note pointing out that this service is not a part of the sacrament of Baptism nor a necessary condition of admission to the Lord's Supper.

The most complete and deliberate acceptance of the historic sense of confirmation is to be found in the *Book of Common Order*, 1940, of the Church of Scotland. Here there are three elements in the rite:

1. The ratification or confirmation of baptismal vows, including public profession of faith.

2. The confirmation of the candidate by the Holy Spirit, through the prayer and imposition of hands (or elevation in blessing) of the minister.

3. The formal act of admission to the Lord's Table.

For the first time we now have a complete confirmation rite, with the Godward side of the ordinance made explicit as a means of grace, the manward act of responding in faith to

God's earlier approach in baptism, and the judicial act of the Church in admitting to the Lord's Table. This rite is probably the most developed in all the churches springing from the Reformation, for the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* contains no act of formal admission to communion. At the same time the Australian Commonwealth Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has recently withdrawn its 1942 commendation of the above Order as 'a reliable guide to the conduct of public worship'. One of its reasons seems to be quite sound—the omission of all reference to the Session, which should figure in formal admission to the Lord's Table. The other reason given is the ambiguous use of the word 'confirmation'. The Australian Church does not seem to realise that the 1940 Order restores the historic *double* sense of the word, to include both the individual's confirmation of his own baptismal vows, and God's confirmation of the individual through the Holy Spirit. This latter sense is not introduced into the 1940 Order through any ambiguity, but by way of restoring the major sense of the term. This is the strength of the 1940 rite, which promises to end the liturgical confusions of Presbyterians in this matter of confirmation. The Australian Church in its own *Book of Common Order* has been mentioned as sharing in this confusion, through its mistaken use of the confirmation prayer borrowed from the Anglican rite.

(*c*) *Conclusions*

It is plain that the liturgical practice of Presbyterian Churches has travelled a long way since the barren practices that succeeded the Reformation. It is also plain that in its most developed form the confirmation rite of the 1940 *Book of Common Order* (and the 1908 Book of the American Church) remains within Reformed principles in this sphere. In fact it might be claimed that it is only recently that we have succeeded in fulfilling the wishes of both Luther and Calvin, in restoring the blessing through imposition of hands, and in drawing up a suitable rite for the purpose.

At the same time there is still much confusion in terminology, and in the meaning or intention of the rite, for the emphasis is variously placed on the elements of profession of faith, confirmation of the candidate, or admission to full communion. The confusion is encouraged by the common practice of referring to the whole rite as 'joining the Church'. While a considerable liturgical clarification has occurred (though it has yet to become more widely understood), it seems that only a thorough theological statement of the relation of confirmation to God, the individual, the Church, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper can finally satisfy us in this matter. To this end it is necessary to examine the views of other sections of the Western Church.

II. The Anglican and Roman Views of Confirmation

(*a*) *The Anglican Position*

It has already been pointed out that the central confirmation prayer and the imposition of hands as found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, are also to be found at various points in Presbyterian rites, and that the Prayer Book contains no order for formal admission to communion. At the Reformation the Church of England might be said to have fulfilled the ideas of Luther and Calvin, for its confirmation rite retains the catechising as a pre-requisite, and includes the profession of faith in the form of confirmation of baptismal vows, and the confirmation of the candidate in the Holy Spirit through imposition of hands. Whereas Reformed Churches restrict the performance of the rite to a presbyter, Anglican confirmation is restricted to the bishop. This is the only difference, and one that hardly touches the substance of the rite.

(*b*) *The Roman Church*

While regarded as the second of the seven sacraments, confirmation is only a 'secondary sacrament' since it is not an indispensable means of salvation. Nor does it endow with anything new in kind or in principle as compared with baptism. It is spoken of as the consummation or complement of baptism, giving greater fulness of the endowments first possessed in baptism. In particular confirmation endows the candidate for fulfilment of public duty as a mature Christian. This duty is mainly that of Christian witness, and accordingly the gift in confirmation is akin to that Holy 'Spirit of testimony' seen in the apostles at Pentecost. It gives courage and confidence for spiritual combat and witness. The Holy Spirit is given not for regeneration but for strengthening.

The rite is administered by a bishop, and the symbol employed is that of anointing with oil and signing with the sign of the cross. There is a current tendency to grant permission to a priest to administer confirmation in certain circumstances, as has always been done on Roman Catholic mission fields. And there has been a comparatively recent restoration of the imposition of hands as part of the rite, although this does not seem even yet to be the central action in the ordinance, except for those more subtle Roman theologians who have argued that imposition of hands is involved in the act of anointing on the head with oil. However both these developments bring the rite more into line with the practice of other sections of the Western Church.

(*c*) *The View of Confirmation in the Western Church*

There are certain similarities found in the Roman, the Anglican, and the Reformed Churches, as far as the rite itself is concerned. All separate it from infant baptism, to which it is attached in the Eastern Church, and normally confirm in later childhood or in adolescence. All restrict it to an official representative of the Church corporate, whether bishop or priest or presbyter. All use the symbol of imposition of hands, although the Roman Church is somewhat confused at this point. All relate confirmation to first communion, usually as preceding, although it may come shortly afterwards in the Roman practice. All regard it as some kind of complement to baptism that has taken place in infancy.

There are also similarities in so far as the interpretation of the rite is concerned. The Roman Church retains the medieval view that it means a further gift of the Holy Spirit for strengthening. The Church of England adopted this view also when it changed the words of the confirmation prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book of Cranmer, words which are traceable back to the second century. These had been that God would 'send down from heaven' the Holy Spirit, but in the 1552 and later books they become 'strengthen them' with the Holy Spirit. The change suggests that the medieval conception of baptism as a complete act of initiation, and of confirmation as a rite of strengthening, complementary to baptism but adding nothing to it, has been adopted. It will come as a surprise to some to realise that this is also the meaning to be found in Presbyterian forms or discussions of the rite of confirmation. The fullest of these is that of H. J. Wotherspoon in his *Religious Values in the Sacraments*, described by the late Dr Dickie as genuine Reformed sacramental teaching. Wotherspoon describes confirmation as designed to bring forth the fruits of baptism and to endow for further service by gifting the distinctive personal qualities that mark the special witness and service of individuals. He distinguishes between the general saving grace of baptism and the particular individualised gifts of the Holy Spirit granted to the mature individual. Even so doughty an opponent of Rome as P. T. Forsyth speaks of confirmation in similar fashion: 'It gives no divine gift that baptism did not give', but it realised and makes explicit in the individual the gift of salvation offered in baptism.

It is possible then, to speak of a Western view of confirmation which regards it as a non-essential rite, related to baptism not as its completion but as its complement, and gifting the fulness of the Holy Spirit to strengthen the individual for his Christian life and witness. This is the essence of the view that has obtained in the Western Church since the medieval period, and the Reformation did no more than widen the administration to all presbyters, revive the scriptural and primitive imposition of hands, and abandon the description of the rite as a sacrament. The essential theology of confirmation was left untouched. In fact it is only recently that Presbyterian Churches have been getting back to this medieval position! It now remains to examine the validity of this Western view of confirmation.

III. CERTAIN ANGLICAN CRITICISMS OF THIS WESTERN VIEW

Considerable discussion of the practice and theology of Infant Baptism has been proceeding in the Church of England, and concurrently there has been further examination of confirmation. In the words of Professor A. M. Ramsay, '. . . the real need is for . . . a fresh examination of our whole Western theology and practice, including the doctrine both of confirmation and of infant baptism together . . . and that there should be in the Church a theological study of Christian initiation as a whole . . .' (*Theology*, September 1945).

A very valuable Report has been issued by a Theological

Commission appointed by the two Archbishops, entitled *The Theology of Christian Initiation* (1948), which looks upon confirmation as the second part of a complex rite of initiation which starts with infant baptism. It will be most useful to examine this point of view in its most thorough-going form as presented by Dom Gregory Dix in a lecture at Oxford in 1946, and in other places.

In Dr Dix's view water-baptism 'incorporates a man into that Body (i.e. the Church) from the eternal point of view, but the gift of "the Spirit" in confirmation is what makes him a living member of that Body *within time*. Thus only the confirmed may take part in the eucharist, which is the vital act of the Body in time.' And again: 'Baptism into the death and resurrection of Christ and the Pentecostal Baptism of the Spirit are not one thing, but two, both of them necessary and inseparably connected, but not the same thing. . . . These are two moments in a single salvation into eternity . . . the Spirit is shed forth only upon those already united to the crucified and risen Christ, by faith, and regenerated and incorporated into Him.'

Others who have held this view describe water-baptism as the preparatory element in the whole rite, securing forgiveness and cleansing and incorporation into Christ, while confirmation is the positive infilling with the Holy Spirit. Thus Cyprian says, 'A man who was baptised and not confirmed was like a cleansed temple without a divine tenant.'

There is certainly strong historical support for this view of baptism and confirmation, as different parts in one rite, each distinctive and essential. The fullest early account of the liturgy of initiation is that in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus which represents the practice at the close of the second century. Here the elements and order of the rite are as follows:

1. Renunciation of Satan and the world	Administered by Presbyters
2. Confession of Faith	
3. Baptism by immersion in water	
4. Anointing with oil	

5. Laying on of hands by the Bishop, for the infilling of the Spirit
6. First Communion.

Other evidence from Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, etc., suggests that this was the general nature of the whole baptismal rite in the pre-Nicene Church, and that the current Western views have departed radically from this position.

Dr Dix gives a most interesting account of the history between the second century and the medieval period, tracing the stages by which the change in the idea of confirmation occurred. It began with the common predicament of many who had undergone those parts of the rite administered by presbyters, but who had not been confirmed because of the bishop not being available. When the numbers of Christians increased vastly and when they were spread over country areas, confirmation might have to be delayed almost indefinitely. Another factor tending to separate the two parts of the rite was the decision reached in the controversy over the re-baptism or otherwise of heretics who had returned to the fold. The prevailing view became the one that water-baptism could be heretical but valid, while confirmation must be orthodox. This occurs in the fourth century. In the fifth century the change of emphasis whereby the now separated first part of the rite comes to carry the significance of the whole rite is seen in the change of terminology; the new word 'confirmatio' replaces the Latin equivalents of the scriptural term 'Seal' (*signaculum*, or *consignatio*). 'A document which needs "sealing" is not valid until the seal has been affixed. The "confirmation" of a document, though it may add to its authority, implies that it was already operative before it was "confirmed".' So water-baptism comes to be regarded as operative in the full gift of the Holy Spirit, which later confirmation can do no more than confirm. In the late fifth century a French bishop is found speaking in a sermon as follows: 'In Baptism we are born to new life, after Baptism we are confirmed for combat.' This is exactly the medieval and later Western view. Dr Dix persuasively reconstructs the way in which this view entered the medieval theology textbooks, while pretending to be the view of the pre-Nicene Church with which it is in reality sharply contrasted.

Acceptance of the more primitive practice of confirmation, as supported by Dr Dix and others, would amount to a belated theological reformation of the Anglican rite, a reformation that was impossible in the sixteenth century when only the form but not the meaning of confirmation was changed. It would also be restoring to full significance the phrase in the confirmation prayer that had lingered on from the second century right up to the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* where the words still were: 'Send down from heaven, we beseech thee, O Lord, upon them Thy Holy Ghost the Comforter with the manifold gifts of grace.' In other words, the meaning that the Western Church has tried to impose on infant baptism, with doubtful success, should be reserved for confirmation regarded as the second phase in the whole Christian rite of initiation.

IV. Criticism of this Proposed Solution

(*a*) *Theological*

1. There is a danger of separating the work of the Son and the work of the Holy Spirit, when the baptised are regarded as incorporated in the Body of Christ through the forgiveness and cleansing He wrought for them, but not yet possessed by the Holy Spirit. And how can anyone be in the Body of Christ and yet without the Holy Spirit who is the very formative principle of that Body?

2. Another difficulty is raised by Ronald Dix (a brother of Gregory Dix). 'If with the Prayer Book we hold that the virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity are given in Baptism, what happens to them while their possessor is waiting for the gifts of the Spirit needed to nourish them . . . ?' As another Anglican, O. C. Quick, writes: 'A theory which declares that Confirmation marks the first gift of the indwelling Spirit, and a practice which places Confirmation a dozen or more years after Baptism, point, when taken together, to conclusions which are intolerable.'

(*b*) *Historical*

1. Patristic evidence of a different kind might be found, where baptism is regarded as giving the Holy Spirit. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says (in the fourth century) 'Let no one suppose that Baptism is merely the grace of the remission of sins . . . ; it purges our sins and ministers to us the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Admittedly this evidence could be used by Dr Dix to support his intention that this was exactly the view gaining force in the fourth century over the earlier view!

2. There is still a gap in the historical evidence between St. Luke and the end of the second century. The only two accounts of baptism in this sub-apostolic period, in the Didache and in

Justin Martyr, are silent on this most important sequel to baptism.

3. While the practice of the late second and the third centuries is undoubtedly as described by Dr Dix, it might be argued that to erect our whole view of confirmation on this basis alone is unduly to canonise a certain very limited period in the history of the Church.

(*c*) *Biblical*

1. The view we are criticising has clear support in only two of the many NT references to baptism and the Holy Spirit. The Samaritans in Acts 8.16 and the Ephesians in Acts 19.5 seem to have been baptised with the water rite only, and not to have received the gift of the Holy Spirit until a later laying on of hands by the Apostles. The double rite suggested here is then read into much of the NT evidence by those who have already accepted the third century practice as the norm.

2. Thus one may read the desired meaning into those passages where baptism is accompanied or closely followed by the gift of the Spirit without any mention of a further rite or laying on of hands, although compatible with such a rite; e.g. 1 Cor. 12.13, 6.11; Titus 3.5.

3. But there are passages where it is almost impossible to conceive of a second confirming rite for the reception of the Spirit, as with the baptism of the 3,000 in Acts 2.38, 41, and the baptism of the Ethiopian by Philip in Acts 8.36, 39.

4. And there are two passages where the gift of the Spirit preceded the baptism with water, as at Paul's conversion in Acts 9.18-19, and the conversion of Cornelius in Acts 10.47-48. Dr Dix however is ready to quote the Syrian rite where the giving of 'the Seal' and the Spirit took place before the baptism in water until as late as the fifth century. The Roman Church explains these two instances as a case of 'supra-sacramental confirmation' due to the special needs of the abnormal situation of the primitive Church!

5. In addition to these more specific references there are many where baptism cannot mean a mere preparatory cleansing rite, but where it stands in a much more positive relation to the gift of the Holy Spirit; e.g. John's baptism with water is contrasted with the 'baptism in the Holy Ghost' which Jesus

would give (through His disciples, since 'Jesus himself baptised not'), Mark 1.8 = Matt. 3.11 = Luke 3.16 = John 1.33. The same contrast is found in Acts 1.5.

Gal. 3.27: 'as many of you as were baptised into Christ did put on Christ', is the same identification as is implied in Rom. 6.6 ff where Paul speaks of being buried and rising with Christ.

Titus 3.5: 'he saved us through the washing of regeneration and of renewing of the Holy Ghost which he poured out upon us richly . . . ' Bernard, an Anglican commentator, makes this refer to two actions, the second being confirmation; but other commentators, phrasing the passage differently, equate the washing, i.e. baptism on the one hand, with the Holy Spirit's regenerating and renewing action on the other.

6. Just as circumcision is spoken of as the 'seal' of the old covenant (Rom. 4.11) so baptism in the NT is called a 'seal' of the new covenant. This baptism could mean the narrower water rite, or the wider rite that sometimes at least seemed to include what we call confirmation; it could never mean confirmation itself, as it came to do several centuries later. It is also relevant to note that the English word 'confirmation' is used to translate eleven Hebrew and four Greek words in the Scriptures, but none of these is connected with baptism or an ecclesiastical rite.

Conclusions

1. The existence of a second aspect of the initiatory rite, equivalent to what we call confirmation, can be neither adequately proved nor completely disproved from the NT.

2. At the same time we can be certain that if it existed it was not regarded as essential or as sufficiently important to carry the meaning attached to it in the third century, and suggested for it again today. The most that can be said with confidence is that 'in *some* parts of the Church from quite early times the gift of the Spirit came to be associated with the laying on of hands' (W. F. Flemington).

V. Necessity of a Third Approach to the Meaning of Confirmation

The position that we have been forced to reject may be regarded as an extreme position whereby too little content is given to infant baptism and too much to confirmation. On the other hand the current view in the Western Churches may be regarded as occupying the other extreme, and placing too much meaning in infant baptism and leaving nothing essential for the later rite of confirmation. The 'theological weight' attached to each may be compared if we examine the central prayer in the various orders for infant baptism and place it alongside the confirmation prayers used by the same churches.

(*a*) *Criticism of the Current Western Views*

1. There is a certain strain apparent in the theology of infant baptism in these churches, due to the attempt to make it carry the whole meaning attached to adult baptism. In the Roman Church this is apparent in its doctrine of infant regeneration, and in the Reformed Churches it appears in the various attempts to find an infant equivalent for the faith of the adult candidate for baptism, so that 'faith by proxy' and 'unconscious faith' are posited. These attempts have little in common with what the NT means by faith.

2. At the same time the later rite of confirmation, where the response of faith that is regarded as essential for the sacrament of baptism does occur, is regarded as adding nothing essential to baptism and as having no soteriological significance! Presbyterian writers have done their best to provide another significance for confirmation within the concept of a 'general ministry of benediction' in which supplementary gifts of the Holy Spirit are conveyed. Calvin, Wotherspoon, O. B. Milligan, and writers in the *Church Service Society Annual* all take this approach. But there is no theological reason why confirmation so interpreted should be retained in its historic position, or given any fixed relationship to either baptism or the Lord's Supper. Once an age of responsibility is reached confirmation could occur and could be repeated on subsequent occasions throughout life. It would seem that certain judicial and psychological values attached to confirmation, rather than its essential theological meaning, have served to justify its present position and use in the Christian life.

(*b*) *Some Agreed Starting Points?*

Any further and fresh approach to a theology of confirmation might be assisted if we could agree upon certain initial positions, such as the following:

1. Adult baptism is the ordinary form in the NT, and by its very nature infant baptism must be something different at least at some points.

2. There is no specific and clear NT warrant for either infant baptism or confirmation.

3. At the same time the practice of infant baptism is congruent with NT principles of the Church and of God's saving grace, and is appropriate in a settled Church in the midst of a society leavened by Christianity.

4. When baptism is put forward so that its privileges are extended to infants, something of the nature of confirmation becomes appropriate, and whatever is done in confirmation should be regarded as having an integral relation to what is done in infant baptism.

(*c*) *Further Development*

If confirmation is regarded as integrally related to infant baptism the way is opened for an interpretation of the latter that takes account of the conditional nature of its effects and of the whole process in time which it represents. 'In Baptism there is a timelessness' (Wotherspoon), and according to the Larger Catechism, 'The needful but much neglected duty of improving our baptism is to be performed by us all our life long', for 'The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered' (*Westminster Confession*). Baptism may be regarded as symbolising a new relationship rather than a single gift in one event: 'to an indeterminate and varying degree the process, which Baptism is properly meant to initiate, has already been going on in the soul as yet unbaptised', 'nevertheless Baptism is itself a critical and decisive moment in the process of which it is the symbol', 'a process which only ends in heaven and cannot therefore be intelligibly thought of as wholly complete in the moment when the Sacrament is performed' (O. C. Quick).

In similar fashion confirmation may be regarded as a second and answering moment in this process. Neither moment should be thought of as carrying the whole meaning of baptism, which they sustain between them. In the case of adult baptism all that confirmation could mean is already included, so that the Anglican practice of confirming those baptised as adults would be then unnecessary, for infant baptism plus confirmation is equivalent to adult baptism.

Confirmation so interpreted may then be viewed not only in the current manner as a strengthening for Christian warfare, but as part of the 'sealing unto the day of redemption'. The Report of the Anglican Commission referred to stresses the need to unite the common functional interpretation of confirmation with this soteriological aspect. If this were done it would enable confirmation to meet the somewhat legitimate instincts of those who seek 're-baptism'—and have to go elsewhere for it—when they reach the stage of profession of their own faith.

In practice, the confirmation order in the 1940 *Book of Common Order* would already possess a framework capable of sustaining an interpretation on these lines. The opening remarks to the candidates would need revision; the confirmation prayer would require alteration to stress the soteriological nature of the rite; and it might be better to mark off the act of formal admission to the Lord's Table as a separate ordinance of a more judicial and human nature, capable of use after either confirmation or an adult baptism. At present there is no provision for the admission of an adult convert to the Lord's Table except the rather negative warning that 'in the Service of Confirmation and Admission to the Lord's Supper there are expressions that do not apply to them'. There would also be advantage in separating this formal act of admission altogether from confirmation or adult baptism. This would assist in making plain that the act of admission to full communion is not what it is only too commonly called, 'joining the Church'.

BAPTISMA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by THE REV. G. W. H. LAMPE

Baptizo and *baptisma* are words whose lexicographical history either originates in, or has been radically altered by, Christian usage. In the LXX the former, in addition to an instance of its common classical meaning, *to overwhelm* or *to sink*, occurs in a quite untechnical sense in a few religious contexts. It is employed to describe Naaman dipping in the Jordan (4 Reg. 5.14), Judith performing purificatory ablutions during her sojourn with the unclean Gentiles, and ritual washing after contact with a dead body (Judith 7.7; Sirach 31, 34.30). Here the word retains its original sense of *dip*. It is only with the Evangelists' account of John that it takes on a technical significance and denotes a particular religious rite.

The latter word, which does not occur in the LXX, is the only term used by the New Testament to describe the rite performed by John (in contrast to Josephus, who employs *baptismos* and *baptisis* in that connexion), and, with the doubtful exception of Heb. 6.2, it is the only word used in the New Testament to denote Christian baptism. Both terms, therefore, appear to have been either invented or adopted in order to describe a new phenomenon which originated with the mission of the Baptist, whose distinctive title seems itself to have been a new coinage.

This history of these words, as well as the obvious intention of the New Testament writers, make it necessary for us to consider the significance of John's baptism as the original source from which, by way of the baptism received at his hands by Jesus, the Church derived its regular practice. Against the background of the strongly eschatological preaching of John, who is presented to us in emphatic terms as a Spirit-possessed prophet, the baptism which he performed is most easily to be explained as a piece of prophetic symbolism, a tangible sign of the repentance which prepares the elect community of the Remnant of Israel for the approaching judgment and purging by fire (cf. Mal. 3.3), and for the reception of the general outpouring of the Spirit of Yahweh which was expected, in some forms of the ancient eschatological hope, to be bestowed in the last days.

Unlike the acted prophecies of his predecessors, John's baptism was not a single action but a continuous rite, inaugurating a movement which attracted disciples. Yet in the case of each individual who was baptised, John's baptism was in fact a single unrepeated act of symbolism, and although the ancient prophets had not instituted a similar collective movement their efforts were, like John's, directed towards the establishment of a purified community of God's people.

If John is to be understood as the last of the Hebrew prophets, standing, after a long interval, in the ancient prophetic tradition, his baptism is most plausibly to be interpreted in the light of the Old Testament. That he imitated the ordinary ceremony of baptising proselytes is unlikely. Although all Jewish lustrations, including proselyte-baptism, were purificatory, the baptism of John is unique in its ethical significance. The convert to Judaism was cleansed from ceremonial defilement by baptism, and although this idea was extended to include the notion that he was purged by it of the guilt incurred by transgression of the 'Noachic precepts', the significance of the rite is essentially legalistic rather than ethical. The primary intention of John's baptism is eschatological; in Jewish baptism, unlike circumcision, this significance is at best secondary. Moreover, the evidence of the narratives and of early Christian art suggests that John baptised his followers himself, whereas the proselyte baptised himself in the presence of witnesses. Jeremias (*ZNTW* 28, 1929, pp. 312-20) quotes Rabbinic evidence for an early association of proselyte-baptism with the idea that the convert enters the promised land through water, as the Israelites had crossed the Red Sea. If Paul, in his typology of Christian baptism, is following the traditional exegesis of the Hilleu school, and proselyte-baptism was, in the Baptist's day, regarded as an initiation based upon the Exodus story, there might be a connexion between it and the rite performed by John, who went out into the desert and inaugurated his purified community in the Jordan. But the evidence is difficult to date. It is at least equally possible that early Christian teaching, and perhaps the

Baptist himself, anticipated the Rabbis in associating baptism with the Exodus.

On the whole it is probable that, assuming the existence of proselyte-baptism at the time of John, its influence upon his practice was negligible. His baptism is best explained in the light, not only of the precedent afforded by Naaman's conversion after dipping in the Jordan, but, more especially, in the abundance of Old Testament prophecies which use the imagery of water and washing to describe the spiritual cleansing and the outpouring of the Spirit associated with the ancient eschatological expectation. Such prophecies are too numerous to cite here. It must suffice to refer to Mic. 7.17-20, some of whose language seems to be echoed in John's preaching, the association by Jeremiah (4.14), Ezekiel (36.25-7), and Zechariah (13.1) of cleansing by water with repentance, judgment, a future dispensation of the Lord's Spirit and the creation in man of a new heart and spirit, and the connexion found in Num. 21.23 of water and fire as means of purification. Behind these particular texts there lies the general association in Hebrew religious tradition of the imagery of water, or a flood, as the type of death and destruction and as the symbolical prelude to a renewal of life. Such imagery is linked in Enoch 66.1-2, 67.8-13, with a fire of judgment and the destruction of the ungodly.

Besides signifying a preparatory cleansing in expectation of judgment, John's baptism looked forward to a future baptism with Holy Spirit. This hope, in various forms and with considerable differences of emphasis, is frequently met with in the Old Testament, the apocryphal literature, and Rabbinic comments thereon. Isa. 32.15, Ezek. 39.29, Isa. 44.3, Joel 2.28-9, Jubilees 1.21-5 are among the more important passages that testify to the direct connexion in Hebrew hopes between the bestowal of the Spirit and the age of future redemption and renewal. In some of these texts the Spirit is associated with cleansing and its operation is portrayed under the imagery of water, a fact which points to the appropriateness of the particular form taken by John's prophetic symbolism. It is not surprising that the Baptist should translate the ancient imagery into an acted prophecy taking the form of a rite of baptism.

With this expectation of an outpouring of the Spirit the idea of the new Covenant is very closely allied. The New Testament teaching that the bestowal on man of the divine Spirit is one aspect of the inward covenant relationship between him and God is fully in harmony with the theology of the Old Testament, despite the fact that in the latter the concept of the Spirit is relatively fluid and ill-defined.

For this baptism of Spirit, John's mission was only preparatory. The fulfilment of the hope had to await the coming of the 'stronger one' whose imminent approach John was proclaiming. Apart from certain adumbrations in the symbolism of the royal anointing (clearly expressed in 1 Sam. 16.13-14), and the language of Isa. 11.2, the idea of the Messiah as being pre-eminently one possessed of the Spirit of Yahweh plays little part in the Old Testament, but the thought becomes explicit in Enoch 62.2 (cf. 49.3), and in the Psalms of Solomon (17.42) and the Testament of Levi (18) it is associated with the hope of a universal outpouring of the Spirit. The fact that the Fourth Evangelist pictures some of the hearers of Jesus hailing Him as the Messiah because He spoke (in terms reminiscent of Ezek. 47.1 ff) of such an outpouring of the Spirit proves that the Messianic hope must have been connected with an expectation that the Messiah would be the agent of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the people of God. Though these hopes still lay in the future so far as John's baptism was concerned, and awaited the death and resurrection of Jesus by which alone they could be fulfilled, the expected general outpouring of the Spirit was anticipated and prefigures in the baptism of the Messiah at John's hands.

Johannine baptism was, to judge from the Fourth Gospel and general probability, practised, if not by Jesus, at least by His followers during the earthly ministry. The Christian rite, as we find it in the post-Pentecostal Church, is still a baptism of water accompanying repentance, but it is 'in' or 'into' the name of Jesus Messiah, and through it the Spirit is actually received. In its relation to John's baptism it denotes fulfilment, though it is still eschatological in its significance since it looks forward to the final redemption at the *Parousia*. The emphasis is accordingly changed from the prophecy of a future baptism of fire to a present baptism of Spirit (cf. Acts 1.8). The cause of the difference between the Christian and Johannine rites is, as

Cullmann, Flemington, and others have shown, to be sought in the baptism of Jesus seen as the foreshadowing and symbol of His mission as Son and Servant, of His death, resurrection, and ascension, and of the New Covenant which He inaugurated through these saving events.

Whereas the multitudes were baptised by John as a Remnant constituted to await the Messianic age, Jesus received the promised bestowal of the Spirit, and the association of water and Spirit prefigured in the prophets' metaphorical language was translated into reality. When His death and resurrection had established the New Covenant and the Spirit could be poured out on all who responded to His saving work by faith, this union of water and Spirit became normative for the doctrine and practice of the Church's baptism.

The descent of the Spirit is immediately followed by the declaration of the divine sonship of Jesus. Sonship and Spirit-possession are in fact identical. Hence the descent of the Spirit does not represent a possession by an impersonal force, but a state of personal union with the Father. The 'resting' of the Spirit is of a different quality from the partial and temporary inspiration of a prophet. The Spirit descends, according to Luke, 'in bodily form' as a dove, resting upon the Messiah with the fullest endowment of divine power. There may be some further symbolism in the imagery. Philo's interpretation of Gen. 15.9 is often mentioned in this connexion, but there the περιστέρα (the word employed in the Gospels) symbolises human wisdom; it is the τρυγών which signifies the divine wisdom. It is more probable that there is an allusion to the dove which acted as the precursor of the first covenant with Noah, for this is the beginning of the final covenant between God and man.

The voice which follows the descent of the dove proclaims Jesus as Son of God in terms which (in the Marcan version and the Alexandrian text of Luke) associate Messianic sonship with the role of the Servant, and perhaps, in the word ἀγαπητός with that of Isaac as the son who is also the sacrificial victim. In his participation in a baptism of sinners awaiting judgment we may plausibly see a symbol of the role of the Servant as the bearer of the 'sins of many', and in view of the Old Testament imagery of the flood or the depths as the symbol of death and

Hades the baptism of Jesus foreshadows his death and resurrection. We find in fact that, just as Jesus refers to the baptism of John in answer to the question whence He derives His authority, so He connects His coming death with baptism on two occasions. Both in Mark 10.38 and in Luke 12.50 He probably refers to His actual baptism as Servant-Son, a prefiguring which was shortly to be manifested in reality at Calvary. If this is so, we have an explanation why Paul could lay immense stress upon baptism as a figurative participation in Christ's death and resurrection without apparently arousing surprise or opposition.

It was of the Servant that it was said, 'I have put my Spirit upon him', but it was not until His baptism in the Jordan was completed in the *baptisma* of the Cross that the promise of a general bestowal of the Spirit was fulfilled. The statement of the Fourth Gospel that 'Spirit was not yet because Jesus was not yet glorified' is implicit in all the records. Indeed His baptism was proleptic in the additional sense that it anticipated the reception of the promise of the Holy Ghost after the Ascension (cf. Acts 2.33; Eph. 4.4-10). The Marcan and Matthaean accounts of the baptism may symbolise the fact that the risen and ascended Lord was the giver of the Spirit. Such may be the significance of the emphasis laid upon the ascension from the water (εὐθέως, ἀναβαίνων, ἀνέβη εὐθύς). ἀναβαίνειν, which is most frequently used of going up to the Temple sanctuary or the holy city, is employed seven times in the New Testament of the Ascension of Christ. If this is the meaning intended by Mark and Matthew, Luke omits to reproduce it, no doubt because he has reserved for Acts a full account of the Ascension itself. He does, however, copy their language in describing the baptism of the Ethiopian, where he may be drawing a parallel between a typical Christian baptism and that of Christ.

When the completion of the work of Christ made it possible for believers to be baptised in His name, their baptism corresponded to His own, except in that it was for remission of sins. As the latter prefigured Christ's death, so the former looks back to it and applies its efficacy to the convert who mystically participates in it; as the latter was the moment of the declaration of sonship, so the former is the moment of entry into the status of adoptive sonship; as the latter took place at a baptism of 'all the people' (Luke 3.21), so the former is a sacrament of incorporation into the new people of the Messiah; and as sonship and the gift of the Spirit are inseparably connected in Christ's baptism, so they are in Christian baptism. If baptism is a representation or re-enactment of the baptism of Jesus, the gift of the Spirit cannot be dissociated from the rite in which Christ's death and resurrection are made present and the believer is incorporated into him.

The fulfilment of promise which had occurred in Christ's baptism was, as the risen Lord told His disciples, soon to be extended to them. For His followers, too, John's baptism would be completed by a baptism of the Spirit (Acts 1.5). They were to participate in His own baptism as Servant-Messiah; the nationalist expectation of a restoration of the kingdom to Israel was therefore to be discarded. The *Parousia*, however, was not yet realised; the gift of the Spirit was thus both a fulfilment of prophetic expectation and the basis of a new eschatological hope. It was the pledge of the final consummation when the ascended Lord should in like manner return (Acts 1.11). Both Luke and the Fourth Evangelist describe the realisation of the ancient hope of a general outpouring of the Spirit through the action of the glorified Messiah.

The particular form in which Luke portrays that action, namely his Pentecost narrative, is coloured by his peculiar conception of the Spirit, which is for him primarily the missionary Spirit of prophecy and tongues, inspiring the Church in its world-wide task. Yet we must depend upon him for our information about the significance of baptism in the primitive Jerusalem community. In fact what he has to tell us is confirmed by the general witness of the New Testament at least in so far as he lays emphasis on the idea of the Church as a Spirit-possessed society—a thought which runs through almost all the New Testament writings and is certainly primitive (we may compare Rom. 8.9; 1 Cor. 12.5; Heb. 2.4; Jas. 4.5; 1 Peter 4.14)—on the fact that it is through Christ that the Spirit is received (cf. Acts 5.31-2; Gal. 4.6; Phil. 2.19; John 14.16-17), and on baptism as the means by which converts come to belong to Christ by being entered in His name as members of His people, and so to receive a share in His Messianic anointing with the Spirit. Viewed against the background of the symbolism of Christ's baptism, even Luke's picture of primitive baptism in Acts 3.28 contains latent within it the Pauline idea that through the old rite, transformed by the general bestowal of the Spirit through Christ, there is effected an incorporation of the believer into the crucified and risen Lord.

The full Pauline doctrine of baptism does, however, represent a more profound realisation of the implications of these truths than Luke himself attained. This is partly due to his personal experience, partly to his nearer approach to a conception of the Spirit as personal, since he virtually identifies the Spirit's operation with the presence of the risen Lord in the believer and the Church. This Christocentric doctrine of the Spirit is itself due to the fact that, unlike Luke, he explicitly makes the Atonement and the consequent justification and sanctification of the sinner through faith central to his baptismal theology.

For Paul faith, elicited by the hearing of the word, is in a sense prior to baptism and to all else except the divine grace; but he does not attempt to separate the reception of the word from baptism, which is the visible sign of the gospel and the effective means by which it is applied to the convert. In his rather testy language to the Corinthians he is not concerned to disparage the importance of baptism. On the contrary, his point is that there can be no baptism in the name of Paul or any other teacher, because only Christ was crucified for the believer and it is only through baptism into him that the saving effects of the Atonement can be applied. Such application implies forgiveness, the washing away of sin (cf. 1 Cor. 6.11; Eph. 5.26-7). This takes place only because baptism signifies union with Christ and consequently the state of being in the Spirit which justifies and sanctifies (1 Cor. 6.11). As the Israelites in the Exodus were baptised into Moses, so the Christian baptised in Christ's name is given the status of being in Christ (1 Cor. 10.2). Baptism is an initiation, and, like most initiations, contains the element of *mimesis*. It is baptism into the death and resurrection of Jesus, and is in a sense a recapitulation of His own baptism. By virtue of participation in Christ's death and resurrection the Christian likewise receives the promise of the Spirit, but the Spirit is now, so to speak, recognisable as the Spirit of Christ and it is as being in Christ that the Christian is in the Spirit. Spirit-possession, again, brings with it the assurance of sonship (Rom. 8.15-16). Union with Christ in His death and resurrection involves a new creation, for it means the putting-off of the old man and the putting-on of the new man renewed after the Creator's image. He who is baptised into Christ may be said to put on Christ (Gal. 3.27). Hence, baptism is contrasted with circumcision, for it signifies a total putting-off of the whole 'body of the flesh' (Col. 2.11-12), and in the reception of the Spirit there is the fulfilment of the prophetic hope of the inward circumcision of the heart, the seal and sign of the New Covenant (Rom. 2.28-9; Phil. 3.3). Because baptism into Christ is synonymous with the reception of the Spirit, it is also the sign and means of entry into the spiritual fellowship which is Christ's body, the Spirit-possessed community which is the sphere of the *koinonia* of the Spirit.

Paul's conception of the Spirit and of baptism is always, however, eschatological. The Spirit is the token first instalment of the ultimate total redemption, the assurance and partial fulfilment of the consummation, the salvation of the whole man. Hence in 2 Cor. 21.21-2; Eph. 1.13, 4.30, the Spirit is the seal which marks the convert for future redemption, that is, it is the sign of a man being the property, as it were, of God, and recognised as His own. The use of the aorist tense in these passages indicates that Paul associates the reception of this seal with a definite moment in the experience of his hearers. In the light of Pauline and general New Testament teaching, there can be little doubt that the moment is that of baptism. These passages appear to mean that the indwelling of the Spirit is one aspect of the state of being in Christ which is received through faith in baptism. Union with Christ involves participation in his baptismal anointing, and the reception of the unction of the Spirit that is the token and seal of our status as the covenant people and the assurance of a day of redemption.

Titus 3.5 does not tell against this interpretation of the matter. That text cannot properly be adduced to support a dichotomy between a baptism in water and a 'Spirit-baptism' considered as separate sacramental rites. The genitives, 'of regeneration' and 'of renewal through Holy Spirit', are co-ordinate, depending on 'laver'; and it is contrary to New Testament teaching to isolate regeneration from renewal through the Spirit. The question raised by the interpretation of this passage, however, bears an obvious relation to the problem whether the apparently confused evidence of Acts indicates a separation in the practice of the primitive Church between baptism itself and some kind of 'Confirmation' considered as the sign of the Spirit's bestowal.

The situation implied in Acts 2.38 is parallel to that which we find in the Pauline Epistles. Peter's converts receive a baptism which is apparently similar to that of John, though its significance is changed. They are promised the gift of the Spirit and the narrative implies that the promise was fulfilled. The Ethiopian is baptised, but the Spirit is not said to come upon him, as we should expect and as the Western editor supposed to have happened. His reception of the Spirit may indeed be implied in the mention of his 'rejoicing', joy being closely associated in the New Testament with the Spirit's activity. Luke, however, may not be greatly interested in the ordinary convert's possession of the Spirit as the principle of Christian life; for him the Spirit is primarily the Spirit of prophecy and of the missionary endeavour, expressed in striking signs and special gifts. In the case of the baptism of Lydia, the Philippian jailer (apart from another reference here to 'rejoicing'), and Crispus, nothing is said about the Spirit, and there is no indication of any supplementary rite. The immediate descent of the Spirit on Cornelius and his household is quite untypical of Christian baptism; this is a special repetition, as Peter pointed out, of Pentecost for the first Gentile converts.

There are also the instances in which converts receive the Spirit through the imposition of hands after baptism. It is inconceivable that this was a regular practice in early Christian initiation, and that its administration was an apostolic prerogative; such a view is entirely unsupported by Pauline teaching and it introduces inexplicable contradictions into the narrative of Acts. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that *baptisma* in the New Testament means a complex rite which included this ceremony. The peculiar situation of the Samaritans *vis-à-vis* the Jewish Christians may have necessitated a confirmation by the 'pillar apostles' from Jerusalem of the baptism they had received from Philip. We may, however, understand that at every great turning-point in the Church's mission something like a Pentecostal manifestation of the prophetic and missionary

Spirit was thought by Luke to have recurred. Such a turning-point was reached at Samaria, and the apostles then incorporate the Samaritan converts into the apostolic and missionary body with the ancient sign of 'solidarity' and identification. Luke may imply that they were to become a fresh nucleus of the missionary Church. Similarly, Paul receives this sign of solidarity from an old disciple, who had received a special commission from the Lord. Having received the Spirit, he immediately begins to preach with power. His conversion is certainly another turning-point. This episode may then be regarded as parallel in a sense to the conversion of the Samaritans. The imposition of hands is then similar to that given to the Seven, who, being already full of the Spirit, received, at least in the case of Philip and Stephen, the particular mode of the Spirit's activity in the Church's mission, the power of preaching and of performing the signs which confirmed the word. The Ephesian disciples are probably Christian converts of Apollos, ignorant of the Pentecostal fulfilment of John's baptism. Hands may have been laid upon them in addition to their baptism because they represent another missionary turning-point. They are the first members of a Church which was to become the centre of the Gentile mission and the headquarters for a relatively long period of Paul's work. They are given a sign of their incorporation into the missionary ministry represented by the apostle, and through their identification with him they receive the Pentecostal signs and they speak with tongues and prophesy.

The obscure reference to layings on of hands in Heb. 6.2 may show that in certain quarters this ceremony came to be practised in the case of ordinary converts, but the meaning of this passage, with its reference to *baptismoi*, a word never elsewhere used of Christian baptism in the Bible and rarely found in the Fathers, is very difficult to determine. It cannot safely be regarded as evidence for the regular practice of 'Confirmation'.

Nor is it probable that *baptisma* in the primitive Church included a rite of unction, still less that such a rite was regarded as the sign of 'Spirit-baptism'. Such passages as 2 Cor. 21.21-2; 1 John 2.20, 27, almost certainly refer to the Messianic anointing with the Spirit which Jesus received and which His people share by virtue of baptism into Him. Though an outward anointing would well symbolise this spiritual unction, as in later practice, there is no evidence that it was practised in New Testament times.

Of the other New Testament writings, Titus 3.5 adds the idea of 'regeneration', as we have already noticed. This is probably identical with the eschatological rebirth of Matt. 19.28 though the language has a Hellenistic flavour, and the eschatology is more fully 'realised' than in the Pauline teaching. The difference between this regeneration and the Pauline 'new creation' may, however, be largely verbal. The Fourth Gospel carries the difference of emphasis somewhat further in the *gennethenai anothen* of John 3.7. The same passage indicates the simultaneity of baptism in water and renewal by the Spirit as the inward and outward elements in the sacrament. The story of the illumination (connected with baptism by the writer to the Hebrews) of the blind man at Siloam must have suggested to Christian readers the thought of baptism into Christ, and this Gospel links Christ's baptism and self-offering in the water and blood of the Cross as the source of the two sacraments.

1 Peter, probably in the main a baptismal homily, emphasises the Cross and the Resurrection in a baptismal context (2.24, 3.18, 4.1, 1.3) and the idea of the baptised as a covenant people sharing Christ's kingship and priesthood (2.9), and in its references to baptismal rebirth (1.3, 2.3) expresses the Pauline doctrine of the new creation in somewhat more Hellenistic and immanentist language. The epistle also sets a New Testament precedent for the later typology of the Flood in relation to baptism.

The New Testament doctrine is of baptism as an eschatological and Christocentric sacrament, centred upon Christ's baptism and its fulfilment in his death and resurrection which are represented by it and applied to the believer, so that in it men are made partakers of Christ, sharers in the benefits of his saving work, and, by virtue of being members of him, recipients of the Holy Spirit.

THE BRIDE OF CHRIST

by THE REV. I. A. MUIRHEAD

EARLY in 1632 we find Samuel Rutherford writing in these words to his friend Lady Kenmure:

> It is the crooked love of some harlots, that they love bracelets earrings and rings better than the lover that sendeth them; God will not be so loved; for that were to behave as harlots and not as the chaste spouse, to abate from our love when these things are pulled away. Our love to Him should begin on earth as it shall be in heaven; for the bride taketh not by a thousand degrees so much delight in her wedding garment, as she doth in her bridegroom; so we in the life to come, howbeit clothed with glory as with a robe, shall not be so much affected with the glory that goeth about us, as with the bridegroom's joyful face and presence.[1]

The figure is a familiar one to any reader of the *Letters*, as it is to any reader of medieval mystical theology. Here is a passage from St. Bernard:

> I hold that love in suspicion which seems to hold out some hope of advantage. It is weak; for the hope be withdrawn, it is either extinguished or diminished. Impure is that love which desires another thing. Pure love is not mercenary. This is the love that is felt by the Bride, for all that she is is only love. The very being of the Bride, and her one hope consists in love. In this she abounds and with this the Bridegroom is content. He seeks naught else of her and she has naught else to give.[2]

Behind Bernard stand Gregory of Nyssa, and Origen and a host of other commentators on the Song of Songs.[3]

This Bridal Theology, which occupies a not insubstantial place in Christian literature, is still to be found, with relics of most of what the Church has thought through the centuries, in the *Church Hymnary*. It is familiar in 'The Church's one foundation', in the last verse of Horatio Bonar's Communion Hymn, and in the more unfamiliar one which follows it in the *Revised Church Hymnary*, 'Deck thyself my soul with gladness . . . Hasten as a bride to meet Him', as well as in other places.[4]

---

[1] *Letters*, Glasgow, 1765, p. 334.

[2] Quoted by Gilson, *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard*, p. 138.

[3] Gilson, p. 217.

[4] *Church Hymnary*, Nos. 205, 323, 324. Cp. 419, v. 4.

It may therefore not be out of place to consider this Church symbol of the Bride.

The Old Testament Background

It may be that, as in other Semitic religions, the original marriage connexion for the Jews was between God and His Land. There are reminiscences of this, e.g. in Hos. 1.2, 'The land has played the harlot in forsaking the Eternel', and Isa. 62.4, 'Thy land shall be married', but the more usual relationship was that between Yahweh and His People.

Thus through his own family troubles Hosea comes to discover what Israel means to God, and what her apostasy means. Through her 'unfaithfulness' she has become 'no wife of mine, and I am not her Husband'; so distress and punishment must befall her until the time comes when she shall say, 'Let me go back to my first Husband. . . . Then shall she answer me as in her youthful days, when she came up from Egypt's land . . . on that day shall she call Me, my Husband.'[1]

The symbolism passes to Jeremiah. 'Thus saith the Lord, I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals when thou wentest after me in the wilderness.' 'I am married unto you. . . . Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel.'[2] Again we find it used extensively by Ezekiel. The foundling child of the wilderness has become the Bride of Yahweh, only to repeat the familiar tale of unfaithfulness, for she is 'a wife that committeth adultery, which taketh strangers instead of her husband.' However the future is not entirely without hope. 'I will repay you for your conduct, for scorning the marriage-oath by breaking our compact. Yet I will remember my compact with you in the days of your youth; I will ratify a lasting compact with you. . . . ' Sometimes the figure is given startling elaborations as when, in Ezek. 23, Yahweh has two wives.[3]

These passages are united in looking back to the Exodus as the decisive time when Yahweh married Israel; the symbol is chiefly used negatively. It is the denial of the relationship which is stressed. The wife becomes a harlot, whoring after strange gods, and the equation is made—idolatry: unfaithfulness: fornication. This line of symbolism finds its culmination in the Scarlet Woman of the NT. There is, however, some hope that the erring one will return, and it is in this direction that the later chapters of Isaiah expand the idea making a clear Messianic Hope out of this marriage, once shipwrecked, now to be restored and happy.

---

[1] The OT evidences are largely summarised in Hebert, *Throne of David*, pp. 56-8.

[2] Jer. 2.2, 2.20.

[3] Ezek. 16.32, 59-60.

So we are shown Zion adorned and girdled as a bride (49.18), and surrounded by her children (49.21-3). Her writ of divorce has been cancelled (50.1). Her Husband is her Maker (54.5).

> The Eternal calls you like a wife,
> broken hearted by neglect;
> 'But a young wife,' your God asks,
> 'How can she be thrown aside?'

There are still murmurings of unfaithfulness (57.3-13), but in 62 the marriage song is raised again:

> You shall be 'My delight',
> your land shall be my 'wedded wife',
> For the Eternal takes delight in you,
> And your land shall again be married.
> As a young man marries a maiden,
> So your founder marries you;
> And as a bridegroom thrills to his bride,
> So shall your God thrill to you. (62.4-5, Moffat.)

Here is the climax of OT thought, and the 'nidus' of our symbolism. The unfaithful wife has a promised restoration, and the Marriage Restored becomes a Messianic theme. It is a Marriage Restored, however. Israel is only the Bride in the Exodus, after that she is the reaccepted Spouse. The verses of Isaiah 62 just quoted, which might at first sight seem to support the alternative, do not do so more closely regarded. The joy of the Marriage Restored is to be as great *as if* it were a Bridegroom rejoicing over his first love.

The Apostolic Church

Turning now to the NT, and to the closing chapters of its final book, we find there (Apoc. 19, 21, 22) the recurrent picture of the Bridal Supper of the Lamb.

> I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude . . . saying Alleluiah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice and give

> honour to Him; for the Marriage of the Lamb is come, and his Bride hath made herself ready. And to her it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called to the Marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God. (Apoc. 19.7-9.)

Here we have the Bridegroom-Lamb-Messiah; the Bride, whose garments mark her as the community of saints; the feast, a familiar Messianic figure, and a phrase 'the true sayings of God' which seems to show that John is drawing upon the common symbolism of the early Christian community.

He defines the Bride more sharply in a later chapter.

> Come hither and I will shew thee the Bride, the Lamb's wife . . . and he shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God. (Apoc. 21.9-11.)

The Bride is Zion restored, the holy, new (5.2) Jerusalem. It might be just possible to link this with the common theme of the 'building' of the Christian community, and the final phrase, 'the glory of God' suggests the restored image of God.

In the last chapter we hear the voice of the Spirit and the Bride. Throughout the eschatological content of the symbol is clear.

Taking the holy city, new Jerusalem, as a clue, it brings us to an earlier passage, in the Epistle to the Galatians, 4.22-31. Here Paul uses a complex of symbols the starting point of which is a spiritualising of the story of Hagar and Sarah. Hagar, the slave, whose children are in servitude, is alike the Old Covenant, and the earthly Jerusalem. Sarah is the true wife, the free-woman, mother of the seed of faithful Abraham; she is the New Covenant and our mother Jerusalem on high. In support of his arguments Paul draws in an Isaianic passage, 54.1.

Paul's exegetical methods savour here of his education and it is not surprising to find somewhat similar themes in extra-scriptural Judaism. The heavenly Jerusalem appears in Enoch 90.28 ff; in Apoc. Baruch 4.2-7; and in 4 Ezra 11.38 ff where the sequence of a disconsolate woman transformed to joy and glory, and the revealing of a city, the heavenly pattern of an earthly Jerusalem is to be found.[1] We may say of this passage that here Paul is rather moving in the Jewish OT symbolism than in the full NT symbolism.

---

[1] H. A. A. Kennedy, 'The NT metaphor of the Messianic Bridal', *Expositor*, 8th S series, vol. xi, pp. 97 ff.

We have the NT symbol more clearly employed in 2 Cor. 11.2-3.

> I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted.

Here the group of Christians at Corinth are representative of the Church the Bride of Christ. The apostolic task is that of a *παράνυμφος*; to present (*παριστάναι*), the Bride to the Bridegroom. The verb is important; it appears in another bridal context which we shall examine, and in general in Paul has reference to the *Parousia*. Again the reference to Eve illustrates another thread in Paul's thought. Christ is the Second Adam. The result of God's 'new creation' is the Second Eve, the Church, the Bride of Christ.

Before we take up the thought as the Epistle to the Ephesians develops it, there is yet another passage in the undisputed Pauline letters. In the context of our symbol the passage Rom. 7.1-6 increases its significance.

Paul is seeking to exemplify a principle, stated in 6.7, that death breaks all contracts, and that in the Baptismal sharing of Christ's death, the Christian has died to the Law. The illustration which Paul introduces in chapter 7 does indeed deal with a way in which death breaks a contract, but not the way required by Paul's argument. In fact the illustration in which Paul entangles his thought has been the despair of some of its commentators, and leads Dodd to say, 'We shall do best to ignore the illustration as far as may be'.[1]

This choice of a metaphor, which is only superficially relevant suggests, that the metaphor pre-existed, and that here the Apostle was using prior material, which was less successful in expressing his thought than would have been the case had he been writing more creatively. Certain features of the language of the section add support to the idea that it was a piece of common exegesis which Paul quoted.[2]

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, Moffat Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans, *ad loc.*

[2] In these six verses Rom. 7.1-6, we find *ὕπανδρος* and *παλαιότης* only here in the NT. *μοιχαλίς*, twice here, is not elsewhere in Paul, *χρηματίζω* also is not

The argument is simply that death dissolves bonds. The woman, the community Paul is addressing, and all Jews, were in the past married to the Law. But the law is a dead husband, and they are free to accept a new marriage. Belonging to the Body of Christ, the Church, they are married to another, 'even to Him who is raised from the dead' (7.4).

Finally we consider the Epistle to the Ephesians, which offers us the richest elaboration of the symbolism in the NT. The passage in which it occurs is one in which Paul is discussing the relationship of husband and wife. It is basically similar to Col. 3.18-19, but the symbol of the Bride is brought in to elaborate the instruction. As presented here it is free from the entanglements of OT exegesis of the type of Gal. and Rom., and further is clearly connected with the work of Christ. The Church is the Bride because Christ 'loved her and gave himself for her' (5.25) and contemplation of this leads Paul away from the husband and wife relationship to the Church. We have the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, not only in 5.26 but also in the verb *παραστήσῃ* in the following verse. Christ is His own *παράνυμφος* presenting the Bride to Himself. There is more to be said than Scott will allow,[1] for seeing in 5.26 an elaboration of the marriage theme in which baptism is paralleled to the bridal bath, then follows the decking of the bride and finally her presentation to the Bridegroom, and the eschatological significance of the symbolism is also present in the presentation to Christ of the glorious Church.

Finally there is the line of thought, elaborated earlier in the epistle, of the New Creation. As the wife is the man's own flesh, Eve having been taken out of Adam's side, so the Second Eve may be in some sense 'the body' of the Second Adam. What precisely is the 'great mystery' is open to debate and has received various answers. From its occurrence earlier in the Epistle it could be suggested that it has to do with the revelation God has given man of the *Heilsgeschichte* which finds its climax in the marriage supper of the Lamb.

To summarise thus far, the OT relation of God to His Chosen People is symbolised in that of Husband and Wife, and inter-

---

found again in Paul. In addition there are two other words rare in Paul's letters, *καινότης* (here and Rom. 6.4) and *καρποφορέω* (here twice, and in Col. 1 twice). The evidence of vocabulary seems suggestive.

[1] E. F. Scott, *Ephesians, ad. loc.*

preted in Messianic prophecy as a Marriage Restored. In the NT as we have so far considered it, we find a similar symbol, but with two marked differences. The Messiah becomes the Bridegroom; the climax of history is the marriage of the Bridegroom and the Bride, and not a Marriage Restored.

The question we have now to consider is: Are there any clues to this transformation in the remainder of the NT material as yet unexamined, viz. in the Gospel narratives?

The Gospels

The central point here is Jesus' answer to the question: 'Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?'

Jesus answers: 'Can the children of the bridechamber fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days.'

We note that this saying has a double attestation. It comes from the Marcan source (Mark 2.19, with parallels, Matt. 9.14-17; Luke 5.33-35), but in addition a memory of a saying which recognised Christ as Bridegroom and those about Him as the rejoicing 'friends of the bridegroom' is preserved in John 3.29, where there is ascribed to John the Baptist the saying: 'He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice.'

As far back as we can go in our sources we find the symbol of the Bridegroom understood as applied to Jesus by His own authority. He has placed Himself in the centre of the symbol. He is the Bridegroom, and the symbolism rearranges itself about Him. Moreover if we are to take the coming days 'when the bridegroom shall be taken away' as a veiled reference to Christ's passion we have a hint thus early of what the Epistle to the Ephesians states explicitly. The Bridegroom 'loves the church and gave himself for her'. And they further hint at some delay before the final joy of the Bridegroom. Bride and Bridegroom are not to belong to each other completely here and now, but only after a period of separation and delay, i.e. as we have seen elsewhere in the NT only at the End.

Having considered this well-authenticated saying, we can take two parables, the Wedding Feast, and the Ten Virgins, which appear only in the M source.

In Luke 14.16-24 there is narrated a parable of a great feast. The Messianic Banquet is a common and widely used theme. It can be found, not only in the OT, but in Jewish sources outside the OT. The parable is in fact Jesus' response to a reference to the Banquet in a somewhat sententious remark of one of those present, 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God'. When we turn back to Matt. 22.1-14 we find another parable of a feast, which has certain similarities and echoes of that in Luke, but which has even more departures from Luke's incident. It is true that Dalman has indicated the possibility of a single Aramaic word underlying both the Greek of Matthew's 'wedding feast' and of Luke's 'feast'[1] but the differences are not confined to this one phrase.

Harnack, and independently T. W. Manson, have sought to regard the section as a conflation of the Great Feast with fragments of an otherwise unrecorded parable of a Wedding Feast.[2] This latter they would regard as one of a pair, the first member being the Parable of the Vineyard in the preceding chapter. Such parables in pairs are found elsewhere in the Gospels. Here, on this suggestion, we would have a pair of parables each of which takes an OT theme, the one the Vineyard, the other the Spouse of Yahweh, reinterpreting them in terms of Jesus' mission and His rejection by His own people. It is attractive, but difficult. The Parable of the Vineyard is Markan, with parallels; but if the Wedding Feast went along with it as the second of a pair, why has Mark omitted it? And why has Matthew followed Mark closely for the first member of the pair, and yet been able to include from some source which presumably held both, some fragments of the second parable? Either we should have had both in Mark, or Matthew ought to have been independent of Mark for both.

In any case, however, we have here a parable which uses Jesus' identification of Himself with the Bridegroom, and further, which in accord with this, transforms the Messianic Banquet into a Messianic Wedding Feast. It illustrates how OT and

---

[1] Quoted in Kennedy *loc. cit.*

[2] T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 35, n. 3, pp. 83 ff.

Jewish materials are being gathered round the central identification Jesus-Messiah-Bridegroom, and the implication is that the elaboration came primarily from Jesus Himself.

Thirdly, again an M passage, we have in chapter 25.1-13, the Parable of the Ten Virgins. The central message is that of the need for preparation and watchfulness for the *Parousia*. The theme is embodied in the symbol of the Messianic Wedding, and it is to be noted again how the Bride symbol is given an eschatological-parousia affiliation.

To sum up our conclusions here, it was in the mind of Jesus Himself that the transformation of the OT symbol was accomplished by the identification of Himself with a Bridegroom-Messiah. In this identification He drew together the rather indefinite OT image, giving it a much sharper eschatological point. In place of an unfaithful spouse, whose restoration might well only be a prelude for more unfaithfulness, we have the wedding symbol, a boundary event marking a goal, an end, and a beginning.

Again the Bridegroom implies a Bride, and in the Parable of the Ten Virgins, there is a Western Text addition in which the Bride as well as the Bridegroom is mentioned.[1] Whether or not this is the original text, the deduction is an inevitable one, and the thought of the Early Church shows us the unfolding of that part of the symbol, in the identification of the Bride and the Church. It is not original thinking, but is typical theological thinking, the defining more explicitly of what is already given in Christ.

Once more let us note that while the NT uses OT materials, and serves itself heir to OT symbols, the progression from OT to NT is not one of simple evolution. It is not continuous, for the advent of Christ is an absolutely new and unparalleled event in history, and while there is *une ligne du salut*, its continuity springs not from the processes of history but from the decisive acts of God.[2] This fact of continuity and discontinuity is marked in our symbol by its quite radical transformation in Jesus Christ, so that the NT symbol of the Bride is not related to the OT symbol of the Marriage Restored through natural development, but through the Act of God, and the NT Church is related to the OT People of God, not through natural development, but again through a fresh act of God, through Jesus Christ.

---

[1] Kennedy, *loc. cit.*

[2] O. Cullmann, *Le retour du Christ*, chap. 1. In greater detail, *Christ et le temps*.

It is now possible to assemble certain conclusions from this study. A negative one may be first stated. There seems no NT evidence for the use of the Bride as a mystical symbol, still less of its use as a symbol of a mystical relationship between Christ and the individual believer. Where in the medieval theologians, in Rutherford, and elsewhere, the Marriage is thought of in terms of the soul and its Saviour, where the equation has been constructed in which marriage equals the mystical moment, the source is to be sought not in the NT but in the OT, in the Song of Solomon. In the NT the Bride is collective, never the individual Christian. The mystical marriage of the believer to Christ has no basis in the NT and it must be regretted that its extravagant language has done a great deal to bring into disfavour the proper NT symbolism.

This, however, is not the only reason why the Bridal symbol has fallen into disfavour. The Church has ceased to be called the Bride of Christ in any significant way because it has ceased to regard itself eschatologically, and has been afraid of and ill-disposed to eschatological themes. Witness its uncertain handling of the theme of the Second Coming.

The Bride of Christ is pre-eminently, essentially an eschatological idea. We cannot speak correctly of the Church being now the Bride; rather is it what she shall be. It is the Church as she shall be presented in glory to her Bridegroom. This is marked for example in Eph. 5.27, 'a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing'. It is only in the End that the Church becomes the Bride. The Bridal Supper of the Lamb is an eschatological climax, a terminus of Church History.

Rutherford himself, while greatly under the influence of the Song of Songs, rather than a true NT understanding of the Bride, is not ignorant of its true significance. 'O day dawn! O time run fast! O Bridegroom post, post fast that we may meet!' 'O that He that feedeth among the lilies would cry to his heavenly trumpeters, Make ready! Let us go down and fold together the four corners of the world and marry the Bride!'[1] He has no doubts about eschatology; for him the Marriage of the Lamb is the

---

[1] *Letters*, Glasgow, 1765, pp. 283, 400.

one, far off, divine event
To which the whole Creation moves.

This eschatological content of the symbol can be explored further in Paul's use of the verb παρίστημι. With Paul its central meaning is to present someone, something *to God*, and the apparent exceptions (Rom. 6.13, 19) only stress what is for Paul its proper use. The action can take place in the present (cf. Rom. 6.13, 19, 12.1; 1 Cor. 8.8) but there is even here a suggestion of a future climax towards which even present actions look. 'We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ' (Rom. 14.10). It is the crown of the apostolic preaching and ministry (2 Cor. 11.2; Col. 1.28); but it is also the work of God Himself, or His Spirit (Col. 1.22; 2 Cor. 4.14) and it is used of the climax, the presenting of the Bride to Christ (2 Cor. 11.2; Eph. 5.27).

To speak of the Church as the Bride of Christ is to look to the future, the end of her history. She becomes the Bride, as glorified. Here and now her state can only be that of the school girl who 'wished she was married and out of this'. To be the Bride of Christ and to be 'out of this' are synonymous. Here as so often we have the tension of the present in which we live by faith and the future for which we hope. Bernard, another Bernard, has summed up the bivalency of the situation:

Now we watch and struggle,
And now we live in hope,
And Sion in her anguish
With Babylon must cope.

Moreover this motif and this tension is present in the central act of Christian worship. For while the Lord's Supper may well have carried the significance of the institution of the New Covenant, it also carries the significance of the Marriage Banquet, as is indicated by the reference to drinking the fruit of the vine 'new in the kingdom of God' (Mark 14.25), and the Pauline reference to the *Parousia* (1 Cor. 11.26). It is an action in time in which the Church continually sets forth its faith in the consummation of time, in the Wedding Feast of Christ and His Bride.

In this assertion of the Christian community's faith in its eschatological fulfilment, goes its recognition of the unique position, the exclusive position in which it stands towards Christ.

As in the Kingship of Christ, so here. The People of God, the Bride are in an absolute, exclusive relationship with the Messiah, the Bridegroom. The Church cannot submit to any other, cannot flirt with any other. Deviationism is nothing less than unfaithfulness, adultery, harlotry. The Church belongs alone to Christ who loved her and gave Himself for her.

To explore this quasi-marriage bond which relates the Messiah to the Community, let us reconsider the passage in Eph. 5.22-33. We note that it is the relationship of Christ and the Church which is made the standard of that between husband and wife. The thought moves from the Bridegroom and the Bride to the bridegroom and the bride, and not vice versa. The significance of this is that it brings the marriage relationship of men and women into the circle of the redemptive work of Christ. It illustrates a point made by Cullmann[1]: Christ's commands to the individual are Christian only because of their context in Bible History; so that love for one's neighbour (not necessarily a Christian demand in itself) becomes for the Christian love for 'this brother for whom Christ died'. What is done in Ephesians is to take what could be a merely natural relationship, that of husband and wife, and bring it into the context of Bible History, of *la ligne du salut*, by connecting it with Jesus loving, and giving Himself for His Church.

But, we ask, why introduce Bible History in this form—why should we connect loving our brother with 'for whom Christ died', while the husband's love for his wife is not because she is one 'for whom Christ died', but because Christ loved the Church, although here also the Death is still in the background?

The answer is twofold. 'Brother' is not related to 'brother' for the same reason that 'husband' is related to 'wife'. The 'brother' is 'brother' whether we will or not; but the wife is wife in virtue of the husband's choice. The husband has brought the wife into being; she is more to him than another soul for whom Christ died, because he has chosen her, and constituted her in a new mode of existence, that of wife, in which she could not be without such a choice. And this is after the pattern of Christ whose Church-Bride is because He has chosen her and created her *His* Church.

In the second place, consider two roughly similar statements.

---

[1] *Christ et le temps*, p. 19.

'God so loved the world that He gave His Son . . . '; Christ 'loved the Church and gave himself for it'. What is the difference between God's love of unresponsive sinners, and Christ's love of responsive saints? Nyrgen would seem to say there is none; *agape* is the supernatural love of God, entirely disinterested, and independent of the qualities of the loved one. But Robinson has indicated that *agape* cannot be disinterested to the point of not caring whether or not those whom it loves respond. 'It is certainly not disinterested if by that is meant that it has no concern as to whether its recipients remain good or evil.'[1] Here is good ground, then, for distinguishing between God's love for the world, to a large extent indifferent, and Christ's love for His Church, where in fact the characteristic of the Church is that it completes Christ's love by responding to it in love, obedience and holiness. The love with which Christ loves the Church is love completed by mutuality. So it becomes a pattern for the human relationship.

Once more we can say that as the Church is the extension of the Incarnation, Christ's Body, so husband and wife are one body and the husband is to love his wife 'as his own body'. She is in a sense, the extension of her husband. But in both cases this is a voluntary situation. Christ's love for His Church-Bride leaves room for and in fact demands a free, willing response. If, as we have seen, the Bride is Bride by reason of the Bridegroom's choice, yet she has her own choice to make too. It is of her own free will that she accepts the status which she is offered.

What then does the symbolism of the Bride of Christ mean? It underlines in a fresh way certain basic truths of the Church's life. The Church's position amongst the communities of this world is unique. She is chosen by the Bridegroom, yet it is in her own freedom that she accepts the choice, becoming voluntarily the extension of His Incarnation. She is loved by Christ, and fulfils that love in her own loving obedience. But all this is more in promise than in fulfilment, for the Bride lives in hope. Only at the End of this present Age will she enter into that for which the Bridegroom has chosen her, only then will her own life and love be so glorified as to round off in perfect mutuality that love wherewith even now she is loved.

---

[1] J. A. T. Robinson, 'Agape and Eros', *Theology*, 1945, p. 99.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century. An Essay on the Incarnation. By W. R. MATTHEWS, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Lit., Dean of St. Paul's. Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1950. 7s. 6d.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY thinking both demands and provides a new approach to Christological problems. Such in general is the thesis of the Dean of St. Paul's in this published version of his 1949 Maurice Lectures. In his preface the Dean is careful to ask that 'the somewhat magniloquent title' of his little book should be read in conjunction with the sub-title. His work is an essay rather than a treatise; his main concern is to raise questions which in the light of modern thinking cannot be ignored, and to point the way to possible answers. But his questions are so essentially twentieth-century questions that the title of his book is quite a fitting description of his subject.

All studies of the person of Christ must be based on the New Testament evidence, and take account of the classical formulations in the Catholic Creeds. But when the Creeds were formulated the inerrancy of Scripture was taken for granted; and the Dean deprecates strongly the short-sightedness of those who continue to put out books on the Incarnation with only slight concern for the claims of Biblical criticism. So too he deals hardly with those who, while professing that we can know next to nothing of the historical Jesus, yet combine such scepticism with loyal adherence to the traditional Christian doctrines. Certainly theirs is a position in which we cannot be content to rest.

By way of approach to his main theme Dr Matthews devotes some pages to the Christological position of Schleiermacher and of the Ritschlian School. In the former's emphasis on the God-consciousness of Jesus he finds a statement of the Incarnation which, while starting from a metaphysical position quite different from that of the doctrine of the 'two natures' of Christ, is in some ways superior to the classical Christology and more in harmony with the original revelation. And though Ritschlianism, attaching fundamental importance as it did to value-judgments, is no longer felt to provide an adequate approach to a Christian view of God and the world, nevertheless it still confronts us with a very necessary reminder that 'the only starting point for any Christian doctrine is the historical Jesus and His impact upon our spirits and minds'.

In his third and fourth lectures the Dean turns to look at the problem of the 'person' of Christ as it presents itself to an earnest twentieth-century inquirer. Psychology has for the modern man revolutionised all his thinking on the nature of the self, teaching him the immense influence exercised by the unconscious in the life of the individual, but pointing also (with Jung) to a racial unconscious, which interpenetrates the individual unconscious. Professor Sanday, as the Dean reminds us—he might have grouped with him Dr Streeter—sought with commendable foresight to weave his thinking on the unconscious into his Christology; but it is in the Dean's eyes 'a reproach to modern theology that so little reflection appears to have been given to the bearing of this discovery on the doctrine of the Incarnation'. He himself is bold enough to contend that what psychology recognises as the 'Libido' must have been a reality for Jesus, 'for the alternative would go far to destroy the belief in the true humanity of the Redeemer'; and in the recognition of a racial unconscious in which we all share he sees the dawning of a new light on such conceptions as that 'in Adam all die' and that 'in Christ shall all be made alive'.

Turning finally from psychology to metaphysics (for without metaphysics Christian theology cannot go far) he reminds us that modern philosophy tends to reject the category of 'substance' in favour of more dynamic conceptions, such as 'organism' or 'pattern'. Persons may be regarded as 'moving patterns of behaviour events'; and if we can believe (as we may surely do without contradiction or absurdity) that the moving pattern of the Will of God is also the moving pattern of the behaviour events in the life of a historical person—one who, e.g., can claim with truth: 'My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me'—such a person would be in the truest sense an incarnation of God.

This is an honest and a courageous book, in which a theologian of repute seeks from the first page to the last to relate his thinking to modern issues. *Nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri*, the author will doubtless be criticised from a wide variety of dogmatic angles. Conservative thinkers will question what light can possibly break on Christology from those dim recesses in which research into telepathy and extra-sensory perception carries on its uncertain inquiries. Nor will the book by its undogmatic and experimental approach appeal to those more modern theologians and critics who, in their violent reaction from the liberalism of a previous generation, find it enough to confront the present-day questioner with an appeal to the Word of God and the testimony of the Church. The Dean is one of those refreshing thinkers who are more anxious that we should be constantly asking vital questions than that we should be sure that we have found right answers. He knows too the questions which many non-theologians are asking today, and which he believes theology will require to try to answer if it is to advance. His book may seem too slight to carry us far on the Christological quest; but on every page there are weighty and challenging sentences to suggest that here he is epitomising reflection which we may hope he will later develop more fully.

The hope may also be expressed that, by the stimulus it offers to others, this volume of Maurice Lectures will mark the opening of a new stage in our Christological thinking. Grateful as we ought undoubtedly to be for the recent revival of interest in Biblical Theology, there is grave danger that all that it has taught us about the *kerygma* and the theology of the early Church should be accepted as something which it is sufficient for us to repeat in a series of well-worn phrases, whereas surely it ought rather to be the starting-point for new lines of advance. And among the tasks that now await us are these: firstly, to inquire more closely into the historical realities of the life and teaching of Jesus which provided the Church with its Gospel; and secondly, to seek to reinterpret the truth about Jesus in terms which will help the modern world to understand and appreciate afresh the Church's confession that Jesus Christ is Lord and that in Him is 'the way, the truth and the life'.

G. S. DUNCAN

Enthusiasm: a Chapter in the History of Religion. By R. A. KNOX. Oxford University Press, 1950. 622 pp. 30s.[1]

R. A. KNOX, honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, has published his book, the book he has lived with for thirty years. And what an admirable book it is! We know him in other capacities, and are not surprised that in its 600 pages there is not a dull sentence, nor an obscure one.

Its theme is worthy of the writer. There is a recurrent situation in Church history where the institutional Church comes near to unchurching herself in the eyes of some of her members. Her practice of religion seems to betray the Gospel; she lives in too close an alliance with the world; she is disposed to make too great an allowance for the frailties of human nature. The Christianity of the Church seems far astray from the Christianity of Christ, and among a spiritual élite the felt power of the Holy Spirit seems to open up a new approach to religion. The story is one of disconnected episodes, though there is a concentration in the years between 1650 and 1750 where it is possible, if you are careful, to trace lines of historical connexion. But it is only by undue simplification that you can reduce to a common denominator the Enthusiasm of Montanists and Donatists in the Early Church; Waldensians, Albigensians, and Lollards in the Middle Ages; Quakers and Quietists, Jansenists, Moravians, and Methodists, in the years of concentration. The strange thing is that the pattern of enthusiastic revival repeats itself, not in outline merely, but in detail, and a complete explanation is not to be expected from psychology or sociology, nor even from psychic research.

---

[1] Broadcast on the Third Programme, November 14th, 1950.

Such a book might have been a set of cautionary tales, exposing the priggishness, pedantry, eccentricity and worse, which have beset every movement which puts itself outside the fold of Peter, from the days of Marcion to those of Moral Rearmament. Instead it is a sympathetic study of real people, some of them giants among the sons of men, and most of them more noble than their opponents. They are too diverse to be reduced to any one type. The background against which they emerge is subtly different in every case. What they have in common is the urge to pursue a more excellent spiritual way; they would claim a more direct access of the soul to God than is suggested by the Church's prescribed religion; and this pursuit leads them, in varying degrees of course, into a rather distressing muddle, whose pattern, it would seem, is almost predetermined. Ronald Knox (if I may so refer to him with enthusiastic simplicity) has a genuine human interest in these people, and his history is not a rogues' gallery. As one would expect, he misses none of the funny side. I like the picture of M. Fontaine, once a respectable official at the French Court, who at nine every morning and at three every afternoon proceeded to whirl round on the ball of his foot for an hour or two whilst he read aloud eight volumes of Jansenist *Moral Reflections on the New Testament.* What kept him spinning? and what on earth has it to do with the snobbish spirituality cultivated at Port Royal? There are plenty of good atrocity stories, Wesley's matrimonial adventures being specially well done; but they are not designed to belittle those of whom they are told. They serve to stimulate our sympathetic human curiosity about things which happened to real men and women, not on the fringe of Church history, but very near its core. You begin to see how dangerous a book the Bible can be; and how frail a thing human nature is—how liable to suffer uncanny disorder by the practice of ill-conceived religion. But it is not easy, once you really know these people, to respect the authoritative censure of the Church upon their exploits. Was it not mainly inspired by expediency and worldliness in high places? Or was there a vital theological principle at stake to which, in spite of appearances, the Church kept true? I think that there was, and I am grateful to Ronald Knox for showing in so human and entertaining a fashion how the Roman Church seeks to save such people from themselves. The issue which the book raises is of universal interest. Can you leave the dangerous business of religion to unrestrained private judgment; or, if not, what authority must there be to preserve the glory of God and the well-being of His human creatures?

Before I go on to the main question, how does the Reformation come into all this? I cannot dispute the history the book contains; I am content, in fact, to see these people through the author's eyes, because I find his portraits true to life. The only matter of interest then is what do I make of his judgment about their religious exploits, working as I do in the tradition of Reformed theology as an English Protestant Dissenter. The book touches me most nearly because the language of Enthusiasm has become the stock-in-trade of Protestant Christianity in England. A week ago I should have hardly noticed what lies behind an editorial comment on co-operation with Rome, deeming this to be impossible 'until Rome *experiences* a *change of heart* and an *entirely new vision of the essentials* of Christianity'. Every phrase is a legacy of Enthusiasm. It is now taken for granted in England that true religion will always tend to by-pass a historic tradition in favour of a personal experience, and this has turned Christian witness into a sectional affair. 'Christianity is one of the fads which people adopt if they are interested in that sort of thing.' But Dissenters who are neither Quakers nor Baptists stand in a Church tradition which was not worked out in Enthusiasm. Methodist and Evangelical influences may have reduced English Protestantism to a vague amorphous mass in some respects, but when we are squarely confronted with this issue, I find that the leopard does not change his spots. I understand why Luther repudiated the Anabaptists, and why my Congregational forefathers bore down upon the Quakers in New England. Was it simply a triumph of common-sense? Was it a lapse into semi-Christian expediency? Or was their common-sense integrated into their theology as profoundly as that of Ronald Knox, though in a different way?

I think it was. And I take leave at this point to glance at what he does with the Reformers. He knows better than to turn them into Enthusiasts. Nor does he say, though I think that once he would have liked to, that what Quakers, Moravians, and Methodists did, was to carry the principles of the Reformation to their logical conclusion; and that Jansenists and Quietists tried to carry these principles into the post-Tridentine Roman Church. The challenge offered to the historic tradition at the Reformation was of a different order from these recurrent outbursts of Enthusiasm. Luther figures in these pages occasionally in the guise of a potential Enthusiast gone wrong. Calvin hardly figures at all, except as the grim figure who created a background for the Camisards and for Whitefield. Their bearing on the story is that they so shook up the pattern of religion in Europe that Enthusiasm had a free run, so to speak, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, because authority was divided and weakened as never before. I will take up that point at the end. Meanwhile you will find a caricature of these men and their challenge, scribbled, as it were, on the wall, between the sympathetic portraits of the Enthusiasts—a hint of real rogues for whom there is no place in this gallery. It would be fun to reply with a *tu quoque*, but it is time to get down to our common concern—though I fear Monsignor Knox will deem it brazen effrontery on my part to speak in such terms.

What do you do when a group of people, complete, one may safely suppose, with a wealthy patroness, takes the Gospel promise of grace more seriously than the rest of the Church appears capable of doing? It is no good giving them a picture of the Church as a great historical institution, moving continuously through history, visibly bound to the Apostolic age, and closely knit into the fabric of the world. You cannot satisfy their plea for a complete fulfilment of the promise here and now by talking about a development which has to be slowly worked out in history before it can be unveiled beyond history. You will not persuade them that the Church is none the worse because at the moment she happens to lack miracles or prophecy, martyrs or persons of exemplary goodness. You can never make a convincing case for saying that her disposition to compromise with the world or with human nature, so far from being a half-hearted response to grace, is the proper way for her to co-operate with God in His decision to redeem the whole fabric of history and nature. Grace, you may remind them, is defined (I quote) as a quality, unseen, unfelt, inhering in the soul after the manner of an accident, whose motions cannot be distinguished from those of mere nature except by a man of great spiritual enlightenment. Grace perfects nature, and you must not expect to experience it through unnatural, nor even through supernatural, phenomena. They will object, first, that a Church which is committed like this to being natural and acting naturally can desert her Lord and have a wonderful time by accepting as natural what is in fact *sub*-natural—the enjoyment, for instance of fermented beverages. And they will add that this abstract definition of grace bears no relation to what is in the Bible. It is little more than a filthy philosophical rag which the Church uses to conceal from herself and everyone else her own gracelessness. For both charges they can borrow ammunition from the Reformers, but I repeat that it was hammered out in a different kind of workshop.

What the Enthusiast wants is an immediate fulfilment of promised grace, accompanied by the evidence of experience both in prayer and in conduct. If his appetite has been whetted by a commentary on the Book of Revelation, the religion he practises may show certain bizarre features, but apocalyptic is not the chief spring of Enthusiam, nor are these movements to be judged by their eccentricities. The fact remains that the desired results do appear, for a time at any rate, including abnormal phenomena which are hard to explain away. Then the Enthusiasts begin to account for the inertia of the official Church, and for the life pulsing, by such startling contrast, in themselves. They entertain dangerous thoughts about the official Church belonging to a dispensation prior to the gift of the Holy Spirit, or they bring out the doctrine of the invisible Church. They entertain profound misgivings about the whole practice of theology. It brings the Church, in the words of the Quaker Howgill, to the point of 'missing Christ the substance, and teaching a religion which was all at a distance, grounded upon a report of Christ dying at Jerusalem'. The mystery of the Gospel is betrayed then by a theology which reasons from the work of Christ as from a finished datum in the past, proving how it secures for us benefits, which in fact are far from obvious, and which do not seem to have been secured very effectively. Upsetting the balance of theology, your Enthusiast will seize on the one point that interests him—say the living communion of the soul with God, or the theme of salvation; sometimes, as with the Moravians, his entire thought moves round one symbol, in their case the wound in Christ's side. He will claim freedom to pursue his spiritual enterprise unhampered by the distinctions of theology. And if he is driven to the point, he will maintain that reason is worthless anyway. A new principle has been set at the core of his life ('Christ in me', or the Spirit of God), and thus he has been released from the exacting task of trying to pick his human way through this world. The abrogation of moral responsibility follows readily enough. And so he breaks free from the great historical institution which God has raised up. He will not recognise that it is there by divine authority to set constitutional limits to the autarchy of speculative reason and human morality. Is he right, or not?

Ronald Knox will teach you not to be patronising in face of such an Enthusiasm. He knows how poor a figure the traditional theologian cuts in this encounter. Butler is the classic example. 'Sir, the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Spirit is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing.' You feel that though

Butler has coined a phrase, the honours remain with Wesley. Yet Butler's was perhaps the longer view.

The Roman Church, it is said, has never learnt to deal with Enthusiasm. It stands firm on what Knox calls the Aristotelian *mise-en-scène* of traditional Christianity (one wonders how far this tradition really extends); and it finds in nature and history the fixed data from which it infers the Divine Fact. It sets bounds to Enthusiasm with a wisdom which has more claim to the title of wisdom and of Christian wisdom than its critics often suppose. You will learn about that wisdom from this book, though not directly. Why should the Reformed theologian remain dissatisfied? Why, in the last resort, is he ready to take up the cause of the Enthusiasts against the Church of Rome? Ultimately, I think, because this Roman wisdom has not, to his mind, taken the measure of the eschatological theme which runs through the Christian Gospel. I do not mean that he sets great store by commentaries on the Apocalypse, though it is interesting that Ronald Knox fears the worst as soon as he hears of such a commentary. I mean that the gifts of God promised to the Christian—gifts of created nature as well as of redeemed glory—await their fulfilment in the future kingdom of God. But all this future is anticipated in Christ. And the Christian word 'Faith' is used to signify what it is to have part in this not yet realised possession. The Roman Church works with one account of what this means. Reformed theology works with another. It has been so since the Council of Trent. Sooner or later the two traditions, not forgetting that of Eastern Orthodoxy, must think through the whole story again, together, and face the consequences. It may be that the world will then see once again a true ecclesiastical authority; one so true to its purpose and origin that the painful necessities of Enthusiasm will no longer trouble the Church. The grim possibility remains, and Ronald Knox is well aware of it, that the rise of atheism, during and since the eighteenth century, may turn this whole concern into the farce of locking the door on an empty stable; but that does not diminish the importance of the questions raised by this 'chapter in the history of religion'.

W. A. Whitehouse

Interpreting the New Testament. By A. M. Hunter. Student Christian Movement Press. 144 pp. 10s. 6d.

This is not an important book in the sense that it offers us anything notably original or challenging; but it is none the less valuable and interesting. Dr Hunter, particularly in his *Work and Words of Jesus*, has already proved himself a master in the art of 'popularising' the results of modern scholarship for the benefit of 'everyman'. The present volume is again aimed chiefly at the non-expert reader, and Dr Hunter has well and truly hit the mark. Yet it would be wrong to label the book merely 'popular', for it is intended also to serve the theological specialist in fields other than the New Testament. But chiefly will it be invaluable for 'busy ministers who are too preoccupied with works of practical divinity to have leisure for keeping in close touch with the pundits'.

'Half of the twentieth century,' writes Dr Hunter, 'has now come and gone. It seems to me to be a good point in history to pause and do a bit of stocktaking.' In this small volume of 140 pages he covers an amazing amount of territory; and here inevitably is the chief ground of criticism, for often problems on which volumes are still being written must be dismissed, if not 'solved', in a single paragraph. The first two chapters deal admirably with the Text and problems of translation. Dr Hunter gives high praise to the *Revised Standard Version* and seems doubtful, as indeed are many of us, of the need meantime for yet another translation. There follow three chapters on the Gospels and the Life of Christ—particularly enlightening for the non-expert being the discussion of possible Aramaic originals and the evaluation of Form Criticism. 'The ordinary reader of the New Testament will be grateful to the form critic for posing the right questions about the pre-literary stages of the Gospel tradition. . . . But he must never forget that the *form* in which the story is told can never tell us whether the substance of the story is true or false' (p. 40). Very wise are the remarks about the futility of trying 'to get behind the Gospel stories to the "bare facts" about Jesus—the facts minus the theological theory. . . . All proper historical writing is a record of *interpreted* facts: history written without presuppositions of one kind or another is a chimaera' (p. 46 f). In twelve pages we have a sketch of fifty years work on the life of Jesus with an evaluation of what are considered to be the ten most important books. There are some clever characterisations: Goguel's work is 'at once lop-sided and disappointing'. 'Bultmann's Jesus might be said to be the reflexion of a Barthian face.' 'Murry is a sort of post-Schweitzerian Renan.' There has been only one full-dress critical 'life' produced in the last quarter of a century, M. Goguel's *Vie de Jésu*. Yet Dr Hunter is much less despairing than most scholars concerning the possibility of writing an adequate 'life', and thinks that, though 'the Marcan hypothesis has taken some hard knocks' and the negative influence of form-criticism and Barthianism must be reckoned with, nevertheless 'in many ways we are in a better position to do so than we were a century ago' (p. 59).

There are competent chapters on the work done during the past fifty years on Paul, John, The Acts, and the lesser New Testament books. But the most suggestive chapter is the final one on the Theology of the New Testament. The best recent New Testament scholarship shows a marked swing of the pendulum away from mere criticism as an end in itself towards a new emphasis on Biblical Theology. This is illustrated by a sketch of six outstanding books from Karl Barth's *Römerbrief* (1918) to O. Cullmann's *Christus und die Zeit* (1946). But do Hoskyns and Davey's *Riddle of the New Testament* and in particular A. G. Hebert's *Throne of David* really qualify for admission to so select a list? Dr Hunter considers that the chief theological trends of the past half-century have been, first, a return to 'worthier ways of thinking of Jesus Christ. There has been "a return to Christology".' Second, 'a return to a worthier conception of the Church and of its central place in Christian faith and practice'. And, third, 'the rediscovery of the essential unity of the New Testament'. At this last point our author is on ground that he has made his own. I feel that here there is a real danger of allowing the pendulum to swing too far. An essential underlying unity there undoubtedly is. But too many recent writers, and Dr Hunter among them, seem to forget that it is still true that the New Testament is a library rather than a single book, and presents us with varied views on faith and practice which cannot without violence be wrested into an artificial uniformity. Dr Hunter rightly rejoices that 'our critics have left the circumference and are bent on the centre—on the unity that underlies the diversity' (p. 138). But Dr E. F. Scott none the less rightly insists that 'the book which unites all Christians has also done more than anything else to separate them. It is full of inconsistencies, and lends its support to almost every variety of opinion. There has never yet been a heretic who could not take his stand on some text of the New Testament; his opponents might answer him by others of a very different tenor, but they could not deny that on his own ground he was right' (*The Varieties of New Testament Religion*, p. 1 f).

It may be suggested that this book overestimates the extent of the alleged conservative reaction in New Testament scholarship. Though I agree with Dr Hunter in most, but not all, of his critical judgments, I sometimes find myself questioning his estimate of critical trends. It is, e.g., only when most Continental work and much American is completely ignored that one can claim that 'most scholars would agree' that 'Acts is the work of Luke' (p. 111), or that in connexion with the Fourth Gospel 'the conservative position does not look nearly so indefensible as it did, say, twenty years ago' (p. 85). The truth is that, while most British work is highly conservative (a good example is the big critical commentary on

Acts just published by F. F. Bruce), on the Continent we are witnessing an odd combination—often in one and the same scholar—of a positively reactionary dogmatic theology and a New Testament criticism which is still very largely destructive.

This book should prove invaluable both to busy ministers and theological students. But let them remember that some New Testament problems are not quite so simply solved as Dr Hunter's talent for lucid exposition sometimes seems to suggest! The book is most accurately produced; but there is a minor misprint in a footnote on page 39.

G. H. C. MacGregor

Bible Key Words: from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Translated and edited by J. R. Coates. I. *Love.* II. *The Church.* A. and C. Black Ltd. 6s. each.

It is no mere coincidence that the same generation which has seen the emergence of an ecumenical Church (a development which the late Archbishop Temple in a historic utterance hailed as 'the great new fact of our era') has witnessed also the renaissance of Biblical theology. The two phenomena are closely interrelated. For whenever men, growing weary of human speculation and disenchanted of secular ideologies, begin to inquire: 'Is there any Word from the Lord?' they are already well on the way to transcend their disruptive partisan loyalties and to discover a new *koinonia* of the Spirit. Biblical theology has this immense power of welding the Church into a unity, precisely because it insists on going right back behind all subsequent argumentation to the very words in which at the first the mighty acts of God were expressed and the treasure of the Christian revelation was lodged, and because thereby it is in vital touch with the supernatural energy of Pentecost and stands directly in its line of action. Such words as Righteousness, Redemption, Resurrection are much more than technical terms of theology, more even than the vehicle for the conveying of good news—they are themselves living things, throbbing with creative power; and in them he who has ears to hear can hear what the Spirit is saying to the Churches in judgment and mercy.

In 1933 there began to appear in Germany a work of epoch-making importance in this connexion, Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Planned on an immense scale, and drawing upon the scholarship and spiritual insight of a very large team of contributors, this work was designed to re-explore linguistically and theologically the whole field of New Testament truth. Several volumes had appeared before the enterprise was interrupted by the war. Gerhard Kittel, Professor at Tübingen, a son of Rudolph

Kittel of *Biblia Hebraica* fame, died in 1948; but the work as originally designed is moving on to completion and publication has been resumed. One of the strongest and most impressive features of this new interpretation of Christian terminology is its fidelity to the Hebrew background. Readers of such books as Professor Norman Snaith's *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* are aware how important it is to interpret basic Pauline terms like δικαιοσύνη, πίστις, χάρις and their cognates, not by their apparent Greek philosophical affinities, but by their essentially Hebraic lineage. This approach is characteristic of the *Wörterbuch* throughout: Kittel's team can write authoritatively on Hebrew etymology, the Septuagint, and Rabbinic Judaism, no less than on the theology of their own New Testament field. Not indeed that the emphasis on close and accurate scholarship has been allowed to obscure the deeper issues of Biblical theology. Kittel himself, at the inception of his formidable task, expressed the hope that the work would not only commend itself to the student of lexicography but would also provide rich resources and fresh insights for the preacher of the Word. And at the present juncture, when more expository preaching is the crying need, this is of cardinal importance.

It is therefore a matter for satisfaction that some of the major articles in the *Wörterbuch* are now to appear in English as a set of short handbooks under the title *Bible Key Words*. As translator and editor of the series, the Rev. J. R. Coates, formerly of Selly Oak Colleges, is undertaking a most useful task; and the first of the manuals to be published—those on 'Love' and 'The Church'—have been eagerly welcomed.

The article on *Agape*, which Kittel entrusted to Professor Gottfried Quell of Rostock and Professor Ethelbert Stauffer of Erlangen, has six main sections—Love in the Old Testament; the Words for Love in Pre-Biblical Greek; Love in Judaism; Jesus; the Apostolic Age; the Sub-Apostolic Age. It is the great glory of Old Testament religion and ethics that love occupies a dominating place and stands both as the norm of social relationships and as the heart of the covenant between God and man. The terrible threat that Hosea heard in the midnight of his despair: 'I will love them no more' (9.15) could be fulfilled only on a day when God should cease to be God and utter chaos come again. In the teaching of Jesus, love is the fundamental demand and the final criterion of righteousness. To love God means to have one's whole existence grounded in God, and to glow with a passion whose characteristic expression is the eagerness to suffer for righteousness' sake. But this is possible only because God has taken the initiative. It is the love of God revealed in Jesus and apprehended in the experience of forgiveness which creates a totally new situation and releases an overflowing love in the pardoned sinner's heart. In apostolic thought, and specially in the teaching of St. Paul, the love of God is synonymous with the divine redeeming determination: it is the direction of a sovereign Will towards the world's salvation. This is the eschatological significance of *Agape*; and when the Christian loves, he is participating in the loving activity of God which builds the future and points onward to the end. 'The greatest of these is love'—for faith and hope are of this passing age, whereas love is eternity breaking into time. 'For Paul, as for Jesus, love is the only life-force that has future in this age of death' (p. 59).

The author of the second manual in the series, that on the Church, is Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Professor of New Testament Theology in the University of Basle, and editor since 1945 of *Theologische Zeitung*. What is the true *Ekklesia*? In what sense did Jesus found it? Which Old Testament conceptions find here their fulfilment? How does the New Testament envisage the relationship between the Church and the Churches? Has the Church an essential place in the New Testament doctrines of the Kingdom and the Messiah and the eschaton? Anyone concerned to obtain answers to these questions—all of them live issues at the present time—will find much helpful guidance and suggestion here. There is a long and valuable excursus on the crucial passages Matt. 16.18 and 18.17, the only two places in the Gospels where the word 'Church' appears: the Semitic background of these sayings is given due weight, and the corporate significance of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 is shown to be the clue to their interpretation. This is a position made familiar to English readers by T. W. Manson in his *Teaching of Jesus* (though Manson rejects the authenticity of the Matthean passages in question); and it might be summed up in the words of Gloege—'The *Χριστός* can no more be Christ without the *ἐκκλησία* than the *ποιμήν* can be shepherd without the *ποίμνιον*.' But when Schmidt comes to speak of the doctrine of the Church in Ephesians and Colossians, his words stand open to serious criticism. To say that the figures under which St. Paul envisages the Church 'have their origin in the language of contemporary mythology', to isolate the teaching of the imprisonment epistles on the subject from that of Romans and 1 Corinthians and to refuse to recognise any connexion or development, to make the 'Christological ecclesiology' of Ephesians a derivative of 'Gnostic ideology'—all this is quite arbitrary, and represents a reversion to the radicalism of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* which more recent study has decisively modified or repudiated. With this exception, however, this treatment of the nature and function of the Church will be found to be wise, illuminating and convincing.

It should be added that these volumes have been attractively produced by the publishers, Messrs A. and C. Black, at the reasonable price of six shillings each. The translations are well and competently done, and there are adequate indexes of Greek and Hebrew words and of Scripture references. In each case, the translator has supplemented the original Bibliography in Kittel with a list of special books for the English reader. It is greatly to be hoped that Mr Coates will continue the good work he has begun, and put students of the key words of the Bible still further in his debt.

James S. Stewart

Revelation and Evangelism. By F. W. Dillistone. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

This book is thoroughly well written. It is scholarly but simple, comprehensive but never tedious, varied but never garrulous. It is written frankly for today, and deals with a question which concerns the whole Church: what is the basis for Christian missionary work, and what is its relation to the religious systems of the world? This question is absolutely central because it links together the crucial theological problem of Revelation with the vital Christian service of Evangelism. For the ordinary reader there could be no better introduction to current Christian thought about both.

Dr Dillistone introduces us to his subject in an interesting way, with a chapter on 'The Challenge from the World outside the Church'. We are shown the fact of enormous importance that the modern Orient in its best and most typical thought has set itself in hard opposition both to the Christian insistence on Revelation and to the Christian practice of proselytism. One of the thinkers quoted, B. K. Mallite, goes so far as to assert that the exclusiveness of revelational religion is the very root of bloodshed and of modern warfare. The positive view of this whole type of Oriental religious thought is that all religions must be ready to share in equal terms in the united search for the One, the True, the Absolute. Christians must learn therefore no longer to proselytise and rather to co-operate in the religious quest.

Next we see that within the Church itself there has been uncertainty. Some Christians themselves have felt that the old exclusiveness was contrary to the Spirit of our Lord. Missionaries have felt called to a strong sympathy with the cultural heritage of the people among whom they work. Attempts have been made to bring together the great religions of the world as a bulwark against rising materialism; especially notable is the 'goodwill movement' between Christians and Jews, with the insistence of James Parkes, that the revelations on Sinai and on Calvary are of equal validity. The most divergent views have been held by different leaders of the missionary movement—the two opposite emphases of Hocking and Kraemer are outlined.

We now turn to a review of the discussion in contemporary theology. Four main points of view are distinguished and explained; and after a chapter which traces the Biblical viewpoint, the author returns in the light of it to criticise and evaluate the theological opinions.

The two extremist theologies are dealt with first. On the one hand is Roman Thomism, with its easy-going principle of accommodation towards pagan religion, yet with its insistence on the absolute institution of the visible Church with its connected culture and philosophy. This is 'a theology which makes God's revelation in Nature its starting-point and advances toward the goal of this revelation in Jesus Christ'. On the other hand we have the position of Karl Barth, insisting that God can be revealed only in and through Himself, and never in Nature. This theology acknowledges no authority and no starting-point except the Word of God as witnessed in the Bible. Dr Dillistone seems to be ill-informed about Barth's position: he quotes only the *Gifford Lectures*. He attributes to him a 'rigid Biblical Protestantism'; to which Barth would answer that if it were Biblical it would not be rigid. He seems to imply on page 53 that Barth 'would regard himself as bound by the precise formulations' of some written Confession of Faith. (What Confession we are not told.) But Barth's position towards the Protestant Confessions is quite different from this, as his recent lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism clearly show. (*Die Christliche Lehre nach dem Heidelberger Katechismus*; cf. *inter alia*, p. 16, '. . . the confessionalism now unfortunately coming to new life in Germany, which I regard as one of the most regrettable events in the German church and theology of today.')

The two more moderate theologies are a catholic tendency, laying stress upon experience of this world and of persons in this world (Temple, Farmer, Quick, Baillie), and a more Protestant tendency, represented by Kraemer and Brunner, emphasising the transcendence of God and the seriousness of sin, but 'denying that *every* connexion between man and God has been severed by the Fall'. Dr Dillistone's own position is that these two 'moderate' emphases, while apparently antithetical, have to be held together in a dialectic tension; and such a tension, he submits, is dictated by the form of the Word of God itself. The Biblical witness is investigated in search of a 'form' in which the Word of God to man is expressed; and this form is found to be a life-pattern, the pattern of the missionary-life of the Servant of God, whether it be the Isaianic figure, the Synoptic

Son of Man, or the early Church. The pattern is seen in the Isaianic songs to be that of Election-Witness-Suffering-Blessing, and this is reproduced in all the story of Christ and His Church.

Dr Dillistone's exposition of the Biblical Witness, though valuable in many ways, is not so clear as the rest of the book; one has to read to the end of the book before one sees exactly whither the exegesis is tending. He makes a distinction between the 'content' and the 'form' of the Word of God. The content of the Word is agreed to be in the person and activity of Jesus Christ, the Lord and Logos and Son of God. These terms, however, while 'expressive of uniqueness, finality, and of Divine origination', nevertheless 'tell us little more'. For this to be meaningful to man, it has to be presented in a 'form', which is the missionary-servant life-pattern of Isaiah. Apparently, the content is the transcendence of Christ, the form is His humiliation, and the function of this form is to bring down the transcendent and apparently irrelevant Word into the sphere of human life and relevance. Now this emphasis on humiliation and service is indeed central to the Gospel and essential to any true missionary spirit. Nevertheless we must protest against this arbitrary division of Christ the Word of God into 'content' and 'form'. Of the several strands woven into the New Testament, the *servant-motif* is *not* the only one concerned with bringing home the Word of God to man; for example, the transcendent *Son-of-God motif* is used in Matt. 11.25, 16.17: 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee'. Before Caiaphas Jesus uses the 'irrelevant' apocalyptic terms of Daniel's Son of Man. We cannot divide 'form' and 'content' in this way. It seems, in fact, to be Dr Dillistone's own theological position which forces him to use this distinction; for he sees with Brunner the reality of the utterly transcendent Word, while he holds with Farmer and the Catholic tradition that the meeting-place with God is in *man's world.* He tries to reconcile the two by letting the Word be transcendent in content, but bringing it down in its form into man's world and man's life. Therefore he applies this curious dipartite exegesis.

Dr Dillistone is, in fact, greatly concerned about 'life' and about the relevance of God's Word to it. 'Life' indeed seems to be accepted as a criterion, authoritative for theology in the same way as the Bible is. By the verdict of 'life', apparently, philosophies and theologies stand or fall. Dr Dillistone rejects a completely relative view of all religions or a Fascist totalitarianism, not, apparently, because of the judgment of the Cross, but because these philosophies will not bear the test of 'life'. It is not the judgment of the Bible or of the Cross which overthrows the claims of Catholicism, but rather the judgment of 'life', that under a rigid Catholicism 'darkness begins to overshadow the spirit of man'. But is it Christian to use 'life' as a criterion, as a source of theological authority, in this way? What is this 'life'? It is not 'life in Christ', not the new life which Jesus brought into the world, not the life of faith and hope. It is just ordinary human life; it is the empirical life of sinful people in a sinful world; it is what the New Testament calls σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα; it is the life upon which God turned His back when Jesus was suffering upon the Cross. Moreover, we cannot treat this 'life' as a known entity which can be in some way authoritative to theology; life apart from Christ is existence without the Logos, it is the Chaos upon which God turned His back on the first day of Creation; it is unknowable; darkness cannot illuminate light. It is useless to eject Thomist 'nature' by the door if it is to be smuggled back in by the window in the guise of 'life'.

This is important, for it is mainly at the bar of 'life' that the thorough-going view of the Reformers and Barth is condemned, Dr Dillistone echoes the fear of many that such a Protestantism may leave the Word of God 'unrelated to life'. The Reformed answer is that we have no right to use 'life' as an independent criterion in this way; and, moreover—and this is an important point—that we must learn to acquire our knowledge of man's present world and life *from* and *through* the pages of the Bible, and not from some independently acquired *Wissen ums Leben*. It is only by the transcendent Word of God that we begin to have real knowledge of this life.

But it is in this question of the 'relatedness' or 'relevance' of the Word of God that we come to our most serious criticism of Dr Dillistone's book. It is truly remarkable that in a book on Revelation and evangelism the doctrine of the Holy Spirit should be so neglected. But this doctrine forms the complete and the only answer to the question of relevance. It is God in His secret self-revelation in the Spirit, who relates His Word to the situation of man. This point must be absolutely central to any missionary theology. But on p. 118 we read: 'It may be doubted whether the event of the Cross in complete isolation can arouse faith in man's heart apart from a direct and miraculous intervention of the Living God. But if there is such an intervention, the Cross itself becomes irrelevant and ultimately unnecessary.' Does this mean that the third article of the Creed destroys the relevance of the second? What is the meaning of a passage like the third chapter of John except that there must be exactly such a 'direct and miraculous intervention of the Living God'? God relates His own Word to whomsoever He will. *Verbum Dei facit opus suum* (Luther). Without the action of the Holy Ghost the Reformed position is unintelligible, and deserves to be dismissed as Dr Dillistone dismisses it. The Reformed faith refuses to fill by its theology a gap which only the work of God can fill—the gap between God's Word and sinful man.

Dr Dillistone omits to mention Pentecost in his exposition of Acts. But for missionary life today this is the whole point. It is only eschatologically, in the hidden miracle of the Spirit, that the life-pattern of the Church is also the humiliated-servant pattern of our Lord; and only when that life-pattern is overshadowed and followed by the utterly uncontrollable activity of the Spirit, only then can it be Revelation to mankind.

James Barr

The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit, translated with Introduction and Notes by C. R. B. Shapland. The Epworth Press, 1951. 15s.

It can be said without any hesitation that this is a most welcome and valuable contribution to a much neglected field of study. These four letters of Athanasius on the Holy Spirit have not been published in English before, but now that they are made available, they appear in an excellent translation with learned and concise notes and many cross-references (particularly to Didymus and the Cappadocian Fathers, outside the other works of Athanasius) which elucidate the text and its argument remarkably, and with a helpful introduction which serves to make clear the circumstances in which Athanasius wrote these letters, and to throw into bold relief their abiding importance for Christian Theology. To edit and publish these letters in a manner worthy of them and their great author is an achievement indeed. That is what Mr Shapland has done, and students of historical theology owe him a great debt.

It is strange that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit should have suffered such an eclipse immediately after New Testament times, but that is understandable in view of the growing failure to appreciate the significance of Biblical eschatology and in view also of the increasing rationalisation of Biblical truth through the concepts of *logos* and *gnosis* in the Gentile Church. As Mr Shapland rightly remarks: 'The Logos doctrine, by over-emphasising the cosmological function of the Word, limited and impoverished the Church's conception of the Spirit' (p. 82). There is no place, for example, for the Spirit in Origen's theology (p. 20). Already in the writings of Irenaeus, Hippolytus of Rome, and Cyril of Jerusalem one traces a renewed emphasis upon the Spirit, but the Christology of the last two men was somewhat defective. The significant fact is, that it is in Athanasius where we have Biblical Christology developing into great dogmatic statement that we are given also the first formal treatise on the doctrine of the Spirit. It is indeed the main burden of this treatise that the true way to approach the doctrine of the Spirit is from Christology, for the doctrine of the Spirit stands in the closest possible relationship to that of the Son. 'The one doctrine springs naturally and inevitably from the other. They are entirely integrated. But by insisting that it is from our knowledge of the Son that we must derive our knowledge of the Spirit, Athanasius reveals, not only an exact appreciation of the contemporary situation for theology, but also a vigorous and profound apprehension of his subject. Here we recover once again the New Testament conception of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the Son, not only inasmuch as the Son gives and sends Him, but because He is the principle of Christ's life within us. His ministry is the ministry of the Son; and all the activity of the Son is accomplished in Him. We may justly say of Athanasius what Lebreton says of Paul: "Behind his conception of the Spirit stands Christ"' (p. 35). And so Mr Shapland concludes his estimate of Athanasius's doctrine of the Spirit thus: 'By reaffirming the propriety of the Spirit to the Son, Athanasius not only secured, at a decisive hour, the Church's faith in the one Godhead; he fixed the line upon which its Pneumatic doctrine was to develop' (p. 43).

It must be said, however, that those who turn to these letters of Athanasius for a full account of Christian teaching about the Spirit will be somewhat disappointed. That is partly due to the fact that here Athanasius is not concerned to describe the work of the Spirit but to establish His propriety to God, and is content to establish the inseparable relation between the Spirit and the Word, which raises the understanding of the Spirit above all notions of creaturehood. He falls short, however, of the great New Testament emphasis upon the Holiness of the Spirit, and says very little of the Spirit indwelling the believer. 'His conception of sanctification is metaphysical rather than ethical' (p. 38). Again, one misses here the habit in the New Testament of speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit very often in the future tense—that is to say, the inseparable relation between the doctrine of the Spirit and eschatology so marked in the Pauline and Johannine literature is left quite in the background. All this must be seen over against Athanasius' doctrine of sin which is somewhat meagre, to say the least (cf. Shapland, p. 168), and his doctrine of salvation which is decidedly wanting in the Biblical notion of judgment. The effect of all this is clearly apparent in Nicene and Chalcedonian Christology which was content to state the doctrine of Christ, in His Deity and Humanity, quite apart from His work of redemption in death and resurrection. With the tendency to state Christology in terms that are somewhat static and metaphysical, it is not surprising that the corresponding doctrine of the Holy Spirit is lacking in those dynamic qualities which are so strong in the teaching of the New Testament.

There must be no questioning, however, of the superb greatness of Athanasius as a theologian, a greatness which comes out so remarkably in these letters. According to Mr Shapland, that greatness 'chiefly rests on the fact that he saw clearly one great truth of fundamental importance in the spiritual crisis of his time, and that he was prepared to state it and restate it in the context of each succeeding phase of controversy' (p. 110). That is true enough, but one must say much more. The one great truth which Athanasius saw so clearly and which formed the very heart of his Christology, he perceived to be the basic truth of Christian theology as such, for everything else hinged upon it. The other doctrines of the Faith must be built up on Christological analogy. That comes out with great force in this treatise where Athanasius is engaged in controversy with the *Tropici*, whose heresy was crypto-Arian but whose permanent feature was a use of tropes or figures which Athanasius felt would destroy the whole analogical basis of Christian theology. In the immediate instance it was quite clear that the arguments advanced by the *Tropici* involved such a misuse of analogy as to compromise the true doctrine of the Son. The fundamental mistake of the Arians was to base their Christology upon their anthropology, thus making human analogies the criterion of Truth and man the pattern of God. The *Tropici* were, in actual fact, making the same mistake, even when they used figures and analogies taken from Scripture, for they pressed them beyond their legitimate Scriptural usage and made havoc of them. In other words, their procedure turned the ectypal analogies of Scripture into archetypal analogies, whereas in Scripture all analogies are strictly subordinated to the Word who is the only εἶδος of Godhead.

Behind this lies a fact of supreme importance for Athanasius, the uniqueness of God and the uniqueness of His self-revelation. The divine Truth is ineffable mystery and strictly speaking cannot be put into words, so that it can be apprehended only 'by faith and a pious and reverent use of reason'. However, 'by way of relieving the impossibility of explaining and apprehending these matters in words, divine Scripture has given us illustrations (παραδείγματα), that it may be lawful, because of the unbelief of presumptuous men, to speak more plainly, and to speak without danger, and to think legitimately' (p. 114 f). These Scriptural illustrations are however only illustrations; they are not inventive or creative. They must therefore be kept in control, by letting the various illustrations and analogies check each other, and by limiting their scope to Scriptural determination. All illustrations and analogies must be criticised by the unique Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, for it is solely from Him that they have their legitimate place in Christian theology. There is a point beyond which human knowledge cannot go, for 'there the cherubim spread their wings' (p. 104). To seek what lies beyond by asking human questions, and expecting corresponding answers, by pressing, for example, the analogy of human generation, is to lead inevitably straight back into paganism and mythology.

The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit is a most timely publication, for there can be no doubt about the relevance of its theology for us today. One cannot read this volume without thinking of a great modern Athanasius, *Karl Barth contra mundum*, for it is precisely the same issue in which he is so energetically engaged, and it is basically the same answer which he gives. It belongs to his greatness that he has not only seen Christological analogy to be the prime issue of theology, but also that he is seeking to work it out exhaustively in the wholeness of dogmatic exposition.

Thomas F. Torrance

Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom. Von Adolf Hamel. C. Bertelsmann Verlag. Gütersloh, 1951. DM. 28.30.

This learned work by Professor Hamel of Mainz stands in the best tradition of German scholarship, and is a first-rate contribution to patristic studies. It shows complete mastery of the literature on the subject in English, French, and Dutch as well as German. Its peculiar importance lies in the fact that here we have an energetic discussion of the doctrine of the Church in the theology of Hippolytus not simply on the basis of his somewhat obscure *Church Order* adapted for the use of his schismatic community in Rome—which has been the procedure generally adopted by scholars hitherto—but rather on the basis of his exegetical and anti-heretical writings. Much of this literature has not yet been sifted through with care, and that is understandable when it is remembered that only a small part of it is found in Greek and Latin, and that most of it is available only in Syriac, Koptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic. Considering the state in which these remains have been handed down to us, mostly in fragmentary form, we are the more indebted to Dr Hamel for his painstaking and accurate study which throws considerable illumination both upon Hippolytus as the first significant theologian to appear in the Church at Rome, and upon the obscure but crucial period in the history of the Christian Church at the end of the second century.

It is maintained here that the views of Hippolytus on the Church were developed in his controversies with dangerous ideas and movements which threatened the Church both from without and from within, and an attempt is made to expound them in their setting in the life and work of Hippolytus. Accordingly, the bulk of the book is formed by four chapters which set forth the teaching of Hippolytus on the Church as the *True Israel* over against the claims of the Jewish Synagogue, as the *Assembly of Saints* in distinction from the pollution of the world and with special reference to the lax discipline of the Roman Church under Kallistus, as the *Bearer of the Truth* in opposition to heresy, and as the *Ark of Salvation* in a hostile world. Two chapters follow on the orders and offices which give the Church its structure and make it an effective instrument in the world, and on the eschatological nature and function of the Church both in persecution and in triumphant fulfilment. There is a short final chapter gathering up the important elements in the discussion and drawing conclusions about Hippolytus' doctrine of the Church. It is never forgotten that Hippolytus was a disciple of the great Irenaeus, and each section of the book bears a valuable assessment of the views of Irenaeus and a discussion of their bearing upon the thought of Hippolytus.

The argument throughout is very well executed, and particular attention is paid to the views of Bonwetsch on the one hand which stress the character of the Hippolytian Church as the communion of those who live in holiness, and the views of Graf Preysing on the other which insist that Hippolytus thought of the Church above all as hierarchically membered. The thorough-going work of Professor Hamel makes it quite clear that the difference between these two judgments on the doctrine of Hippolytus is due to the fact that Bonwetsch bases his conclusions almost entirely on the exegetical works of Hippolytus, whereas Preysing works almost entirely with the *Refutatio*. While it is clear that the exegetical writings stress the nature of the Church as the *Communion of Saints* and the polemical writings as the hierarchically organised *Bearer of Truth*, neither can justly claim to give a complete picture of the views of Hippolytus.

There can be no doubt that it is a special concern of Hippolytus to emphasise the fact that the Church is the Communion of Saints, the Assembly of the Holy. Indeed the evidence of the power of the Holy Spirit in the personal, moral life is an indispensable requirement for the membership of the individual Christian in the Church. This teaching is clearly brought out particularly in Hippolytus' repudiation of the penitential discipline of Kallistus, and in his constant use of Susanna and Paradise (e.g. in the *Commentary on Daniel*) as types of the Church.

On the other hand, as Bearer of the Truth the Church is hierarchically organised, and the episcopate is regarded as the guarantee of the Truth on the ground of apostolic succession, which in turn makes the Holy Spirit, as the constant dispenser of Truth, the endowment of the episcopal office. The significant fact is that when Hippolytus became a schismatic, unlike the Gnostics he did not found a school of his own, but sought with all his force to legitimate his own schismatic Church as the Catholic Church in possession of the Truth, on the ground that he himself at its head was in possession of the hierarchic-apostolic episcopate. It looks as if this view was developed therefore largely in justification of his own schismatic status. It is certainly of considerably later origin, but on the other hand it could not be established without calling in question the legitimacy of the Church under Kallistus on moral and doctrinal grounds (Hippolytus held that the Christology of Kallistus was heretical), that is, on the ground that it did not give proper evidence of the presence and power of the *Holy Spirit* regarded both as the giver of holiness and dispenser of Truth.

It is apparent that both these views cut into each other. If the criterion of membership is the personal, moral life of the holy, any absolute disciplinary power on the part of the Bishop is excluded. Although that power comes into the picture in respect of excommunication and the dispensing of forgiveness for lesser sins, it reaches its limit with mortal sins. Even if the hierarchy is regarded as necessary, therefore, it can only be an auxiliary factor in the Church as the Bearer of Truth. Far from being able to subordinate to itself the notion of the Church as the Communion of Saints, in the thought of Hippolytus it is definitely and basically limited by it. It was Kallistus who first broke down this limitation by claiming for himself as Bishop not only the apostolic authority in matters of doctrine, but the full apostolic power in matters of discipline, and he assumed that power in order to dispense pardon for mortal sins and sins of the flesh, and to relax discipline. To Hippolytus this was apostasy. The Church which is no longer *holy* can in no sense claim to be *catholic*. The Catholic Church is and remains the Communion of Saints possessed of the *Holy* Spirit; possession of the Holy Spirit and impurity are mutually exclusive. Hippolytus was unable, therefore, to bring himself to exchange a holiness of the Church resting upon the personal, moral life of its members, for a holiness resting upon the existence and activity of a holy institution, the hierarchy and its means of grace. Moreover he regarded the means of grace, the sacraments particularly, as primarily eschatological actions depending for their validity upon the Church's participation in a heavenly reality, rather than as the dispensations of a historical institution in the cosmos. The Church has historical existence in the cosmos, to be sure, but as such it is fundamentally an alien body. The Church is a heavenly reality which stands opposed to all worldliness and 'Babylonian' entanglement. It exists in history only by sacramental participation in the Kingdom that is to come, and is the Church only as in holiness it ever gives birth to Christ (who as the Logos is ever giving birth to the Church), and becomes a power on earth only so far as through holiness it anticipates the power of the Kingdom of Heaven which is the Kingdom of the Holy.

It is fundamentally in this eschatological context that Hippolytus sees the function and significance of the hierarchy, as the pattern on earth of the heavenly and future reality. His exegetical studies in Biblical Apocalypse convinced him that in the last days the image of Antichrist would be found even in the Church itself, so that as the pressure of fierce persecution increased his apocalyptic fervour, his increasing stress upon the hierarchy is to be understood as a disciplinary measure in vehement protest against the secularisation and demoralisation of the Church and in an attempt to preserve its heavenly image. No doubt it can be traced also, as already noted, to self-justification in his schismatic status, but behind that there is undoubtedly a deep sense of Christian and moral responsibility before Him who will come to judge the world in righteousness and set up for ever the Kingdom of the Holy.

After the death of Kallistus, the hostility of Hippolytus to the Roman Church seems to have fallen away, and at last he was reconciled with Bishop Pontianus (a successor of Kallistus) in the lead-mines of Sardinia where both died the death of a martyr. And so Hippolytus is to be reckoned after all a martyr and father of the Church.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Submission in Suffering (and other Essays on Eastern Thought). By H. H. ROWLEY. University of Wales Press. 12s. 6d.

THE three essays which are here reprinted represent the incursions of a Biblical scholar into the field of Comparative Religion, but the comparisons owe much to the standard provided by a thorough knowledge of Biblical contributions to the understanding of the various problems. The first essay discusses clearly and beautifully and in a reverent spirit the many possible causes of suffering, but as the title indicates, is more concerned with types of submission. The human mind seems to have great difficulty in getting beyond the doctrine of suffering as punishment for sin and therefore indicative of it. That innocent suffering should be possible is regarded as a ghastly injustice, and the idea that this might be a manifestation of the lovingkindness of God seems, in general, either unintelligible or too good to be true. Dr Rowley illustrates from many sources the efforts to break through this customary attitude, and also to show the relation between collective and individual suffering. His references to Chinese teaching are a little incoherent, and his exposition of the doctrine of *karma* in Hinduism and Buddhism does not say much that has not been said many times before. But he reaches higher level in his study of Moslem doctrine, and shows that the idea of perfect surrender being perfect trust is at least adumbrated. This idea inspires the whole of his subsequent treatment of the uses of suffering, in reclamation, in testing and training of the soul in the direction of the service of both God and man, and he finds the key to the whole upward development in the prayer of Gethsemane, interpreted more revealingly as a cry of active consecration to service rather than of passive resignation to suffering.

The second essay is an intensely interesting discussion of the relation between the negative and positive forms of the Golden Rule as set forth in Chinese teaching, especially that of Lao-tzŭ, Confucius, and Mo-tzŭ. It would seem as if often Chinese thought had reached the positive form, but Dr Rowley warns us that similarity of form does not mean coincidence of content; that the range of benevolence was restricted by Confucius to the nearer loyalties, that the 'kindness' of Lao-tzŭ was detached correctness rather than active concern, and that even Mo-tzŭ lacked the religious basis which would have given his Golden Rule more of a New Testament warmth and urgency.

The last essay is devoted entirely to the teaching of Mo-tzŭ. Surprise is expressed that he should have been so much neglected both in China and by Western scholars, but Dr Rowley does not convince us that the neglect was altogether unjustifiable, although he represents the Chinese sage as an attractive character, somewhat rugged and puritanical indeed, but honest and self-sacrificing, preaching a message of universal love, for which, however, he was unable to suggest, in his cold reasonableness, adequate religious motivation.

W. S. Urquhart

Testament for Social Science. By Barbara Wootton. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 15s.

Coming from the pen by which it is written, one would be surprised if this book did not possess fine qualities of ability, acumen, courage and candour. It would be equally surprising did it not mount and launch a sustained critical attack upon Christianity and, indeed, all religion. Suffice it to say forthwith that the reader will not be treated to either surprise.

The plan of campaign is simple—even captivating in its appeal; and its attractiveness is bound to win the support of many who are not themselves already fortified by the realisation of that certain speciousness with which wholehearted advocates of the scientific point of view know so well to dress up their thesis. The writer begins by remarking upon the wide discrepancy that manifestly exists between scientific and social progress—'the contrast between man's amazing ability to manipulate his material environment and his pitiful incompetence in managing his own affairs'; and mankind's fear of sudden self-inflicted death is adduced to add urgency to the situation.

The second step is to propose that the methods of science, so effectively and beneficially employed in other spheres, should now be applied to 'the field of our most disastrous failure'. This would only be to bring to fruit the hopes and promises which Auguste Comte expressed more than a century ago. Professor Wootton is in no doubt about some at least of the special difficulties that must of necessity beset those who would attempt this application in the case of men and women who are neither mere human bodies nor simple atoms. But, she insists, the new subject matter differs rather in degree of complexity than in kind.

The situation is, however, made artificially difficult by limitations imposed by a division of experience into 'the kingdom of dogma and the territory of science'. Hence the necessity, if the attempt to effect this new application of the scientific method is to succeed, of discussing the relation of science to metaphysics, morals, and religion. The impact of the social sciences on religious doctrine, it is held, is likely to be devastating. In this way, Mrs Wootton's book becomes immediately relevant to the readers of the *Journal*.

No considered or extensive definition is given of what the author means by scientific method. But this is perhaps dispensable. In fact what is meant becomes fairly clear in the course of the discussion. The argument is that if the limitations imposed by metaphysics, morals and art can be removed, the way will open up for the application of scientific method to the realm of social relations. The critical issue will then be whether really the independence of these other disciplines can or cannot be maintained in the face of the threat offered by scientific method.

The discussion of the relation between 'Science and Metaphysics' (chap. 5) becomes, therefore, of exemplary significance, even greater than could have been expected, since much of the chapter is devoted to a review of the position of religion in view of the claims of science. There is no doubt that the writer moves with an easy and instructed familiarity with the method and character of the discipline of philosophy. So far as it goes, nothing could be better than the statements made, often by means of quotations from philosophers and theologians themselves, of the difference between science and philosophy, and between science and religious knowledge. Philosophers, unlike scientists, do not rise one on the top of his predecessor's shoulders: 'Metaphysics can only move in a circle, not, like science, in a spiral.' Religion (or more properly Christianity) does claim 'extra-scientific sources of knowledge', and this knowledge is rightly said to 'differ in several important particulars from that which is based on science'. From the point of view of science, both disciplines are seen in a disadvantageous light, metaphysics because of its lack of 'progress', religion and revealed knowledge because of its lack of universality, the diversity of its alleged contents, and the absolute character of the 'faith' it requires—'to resist doubt is the scientist's temptation—and the believer's triumph'.

From this same scientific point of view further, metaphysics as a discipline, in so far as it advances at all, does so at the beck and call of science. So far as it is verifiable, it is checked 'by the results of *scientific* investigation'. On the other hand, so far as it is not verifiable it surrenders all claims to advance and remains shut up in the realm of hypothesis. All 'this is almost equivalent to saying that metaphysical theories are only certain of survival so long as they are also metaphorical, in which case, however, it can also be argued that they have no meaning'.

Religion fares no better under this exacting inquiry. Religion, or at least the Christian religion, makes contact with the data which are the subject matter of scientific investigation: 'the life of Christ is a matter of record'. But this is not in dispute. What is disputed is not His historical existence, but that He was more than God. Here, unhappily, the evidence adducible is not amenable to scientific investigation, let alone proof—'scientific proof such as would be generally acceptable to both parties' (p. 103). The miracles cannot be repeated under laboratory conditions. The position is not retrieved, as is often attempted, by resorting to the alleged impossibility of suspense of judgment in religious matters, since this is no more than a subterfuge based on a confusion between knowledge and action. 'It is perfectly possible to study the phenomena of religious experience without holding any opinions on the subject which are dogmatic in the sense that, being derived from faith and not from science, they must be retained whatever the result of such study'. This leads up to the most outstanding infirmity of religion; it precludes the human mind from following 'every argument whithersoever it leads', and this preclusion spells 'intellectual treason'.

It is hoped that the thesis and argument of this able treatise has thus been presented succinctly, no doubt, but as justly, even if not as capably, as its author has expressed the positions she opposes.

The course of the discussion could at a number of points have been challenged. But the present writer prefers to make his riposte at a more fundamental level. The whole argument is based upon 'the unique status of scientific research as the sole foundation of solid knowledge' (p. 95), and its entire ability 'to explain the phenomena of consciousness, of religious experience and even of morals' (p. 114). If this basis can be effectively challenged and overthrown, the impregnability of the whole case will be cracked and even destroyed.

It will be convenient to make the attempt for good or ill at another point (or if the metaphor suits better, with another instrument in hand) than religion itself. If the impregnability of the case under review can be cracked in other ways, there will be a *prima facie* probability that religion has not had a fair hearing or been allowed to state its own case. Suppose, for example, the philosopher accepted what Professor Wootton so acutely affirms concerning his discipline, and at the same time declined to regard the affirmations as in any sense requiring him to abandon the practice of metaphysics or even concede its meaninglessness. This, one could well believe, is precisely what he will do, and will be abundantly justified in doing. To illustrate, here is what R. G. Collingwood in his well-known essay on *Philosophical Method* has to say: '. . . the universals or concepts of philosophy differ from those of exact and empirical science' (p. 104). There is a 'kind of knowledge in which a distinction (exists) between knowing better and knowing worse, but none between knowing absolutely and not knowing at all' (p. 96). 'Thus the initial knowledge or datum in philosophy is very different from what it is in empirical science: different in its relation to the process of reasoning, different in its own constitution, different in the way in which we come to possess it' (p. 169). If these affirmations are true at all, it will be impossible to apply the rubrics of exact science to metaphysics; metaphysics will no doubt be written off as meaningless from the standpoint of exact science; but metaphysics will still be justified by faith in its own method. The bold claim that scientific research possesses 'unique status . . . as the sole foundation of solid knowledge' is already breaking down.

Or enter the sphere of morals. It is, of course, entirely possible and even creditable for science to observe 'the phenomena of consciousness . . . and even of morals'. No one would care to dispute the value of such research and its practical utility. The moralist concedes the right of psychology to conduct such investigations, and does not hesitate to make use, so far as is possible, of some of its results. Hence again, alongside morality there is not really any very grave disinclination to have science as an inquiring and systematising companion. But if the claim is advanced on the part of science that it can 'explain' the phenomena mentioned above, a very different situation immediately arises. Is it within the competence of science to do anything of the kind? Moral philosophy has usually regarded itself as both descriptive and normative. It must welcome the assistance of science in its first function, but must entertain the gravest suspicions of its competence in the second. Once again the impregnability shows manifest signs of cracking. It cannot be allowed that 'every time the physical sciences have provided purely natural explanations of phenomena hitherto accounted for in supernatural terms' (p. 115), if in fact the essence of morality slips through their fingers. At one point Professor Wootton seems indirectly and no doubt unconsciously to concede the existence of moral standards independent of science, when, by an astonishing *tour de force*, she appropriates them and allies them with science: 'We can say straight away that no system of morals which does not include intellectual integrity as a fundamental virtue is compatible with science'. This is intellectual fifth column work with a vengeance!

The sphere of personality brings us even closer to the case of religion. One feels that, however specious the argument, the conclusion is not very plausible which affirms that 'the primary moral sanction is the need to keep in step' (p. 155), a thesis which has often been argued at greater length but with no greater probability. It harmonises, however, with a deceptive use of generalisations. Once again, no objection can rightly be taken to the view that 'better (scientific) observation would yield generalisations of a higher degree of probability' (p. 23). As is pointed out, 'a sensible person conducts his life on this assumption', and, it may be added, moral philosophy and religion can both utilise any useful findings. But one may well feel here a certain inadequacy, which emerges from obscurity when the attempt is made to apply such generalisations to people. '. . . if and when we do hit upon the moral standards which are appropriate to our species, there is, thanks to scientific method, no reason at all why these should not be rapidly translated into the corresponding ways of behaviour' (p. 144). What is being imposed upon us here is a view from which personality (in all its mysteriousness) has been obliterated. The application of scientific method here means reducing the man to the equation $AB=(h+e)$, where h signifies heredity and e environment. But in 'generalisations', however useful, it is evident that one does not encounter people, but only people so denuded of their personality that they can be made to fall within this scope. And no doubt the hoped for 'corresponding ways of behaviour' would certainly follow the finding of appropriate moral standards and the application of scientific method, if in practice one did not come against human volition in all its strength and all its frailty. If this is seriously reckoned with, the only equation that does justice to the facts is $AB = x(h + e)$.

If now the case briefly expounded in this review has been made out, it is evident that what this book does is to place each of the criticised disciplines in turn upon a Procrustean bed of scientific method. The effort to make them fit is disastrous to a true understanding of philosophy, morals and man himself. To change the metaphor, many and valuable 'dial readings' are elicited from these matters, but it is not by this method that they can be coaxed to yield a veracious account of their true nature. Where Behaviourism and its more systematic ally Positivism can tell us much, it has been left to Existentialism to recall attention to the missing factor.

It may now perhaps be held that the way is open for religion to stake its claim among the ruins of the apparently impregnable but now demolished case made out against it and the other disciplines arraigned with it. Only a brief statement of the position is here permissible. Two theses may be laid down and cursorily spoken to, the first that concerning God, the second concerning knowledge of God. God cannot be made the object of scientific research and inquiry. Whatever be the judgment of science, therefore, it will be possible to declare that a spiritual interpretation of the universe is alone adequate. If this is a conclusion disagreeable to science, to take and adapt a leaf out of Mrs Wootton's book (p. 185), it will not matter, nor can the term be used pejoratively, provided it is true. Certainly it will not have to be discarded simply because he 'sees no more evidence for the existence of a personal deity who is concerned for and in communion with the members of our own species, than for the reality of . . . the Loch Ness Monster'. Kepler in his telescopic sweeping of the heavens has here a spiritual associate.

It follows from this that the knowledge of God which we possess must be different from that based upon scientific method. It will not be unreasonable or intellectually frivolous to suggest that, in contrast to scientifically ascertainable knowledge, it involves the 'whole man'. Just because the scientist quite correctly from his own standpoint eschews committing himself to a judgment unless it be equipped with scientific proof, religious knowledge will not necessarily conform to this type. Hence the ineptitude of some of the statements here made: 'the scientist is entitled to demand that revelation should be treated with the scepticism which is the normal scientific attitude to all unproven hypotheses' (p. 180). It cannot be too strongly emphasised that, even while religious belief remains scientifically unproven, it does not, therefore, fall into the class of unverified scientific hypotheses. Revelation is not the statement of new information about God, though this is the intellectual cast into which theologians have often been too ready to throw it. It is the confrontation of the whole man by God Himself. Hence when the theologian avers that 'suspense of judgment is an illusion, since it is impossible to suspend living', there is in fact no 'confusion between knowledge and action', but a genuine and real fusion. Self-committal is the entrance into this realm of knowledge, and it is simply not true that 'if we wish to learn anything . . . , we must use the observation-cum-hypothesis-cum-empirical confirmation method of science' (p. 194 f).

From this it will be seen what attitude the religious man will take up towards the attractive proposition that the human mind must have freedom 'to follow every argument whithersoever it leads'. He is entirely agreeable and even eager that this should be so, while at the same time enjoying the certainty that, whatever conclusions be reached, they will be confronted with the bedrock facts of his faith and must finally come to terms with them. This will be an alarming situation only to those who unnecessarily fear that the facts of science are always in a position to achieve greater certitude than the facts of faith, and thus needlessly surrender to the omnicompetent claims and professions of a science not sufficiently critical of itself.

It is not here alleged that this gives a simple solution to all the tensions which Professor Wootton so capably presents. Perhaps the most acute dilemma is expressed in her charge that 'revealed knowledge lacks the universality which we have found to be an essential quality of the sensory and psychological data in which all scientific knowledge is grounded' (p. 102). In religious terms, it is the dilemma that 'many are called but few are chosen'. This is indeed a torturing dilemma for the religious man. But it must be clearly understood that it is a *religious* dilemma, not a scientific one. And finally, while it is in the last resort peripheral in the sense that salvation does not depend on finding a right answer to it, it does, in the religious setting proper to it, admit of practical solution: it is incumbent on the Christian always and everywhere to witness to the saving works of God.

This book has an excellence which even those who cannot accept its conclusions must willingly acknowledge. It may be equalled but can hardly be surpassed as a presentation of the scientifically conditioned mind so prevalent among us today, and its ability and candour could hardly be bettered. To read it is not less than an education for all concerned for the presentation of the Gospel in the modern world.

J. K. S. Reid

THE FAITH AND ORDER VOLUMES

The Nature of the Church. Ed. R. Newton Flew (pp. 340).
Ways of Worship. Ed. Pehr Edwall, Eric Hayman and W. D. Maxwell (pp. 362).
Intercommunion. Ed. Donald Baillie and John Marsh (pp. 396).
All S.C.M. Press, London, at 21s. each.

THESE three volumes purport to contain the evidence upon which are based the three short reports, bearing the same titles, already published by the S.C.M. Press for the Faith and Order Commission. The reports are the preparatory 'required reading' for all delegates to the Lund Conference; but to read them sooner or later will appear to some consciences as a bounden duty—and where are such consciences more likely to be found than amongst the subscribers to the *Scottish Journal of Theology*? Each represents some years of careful international team-work (Dr Flew has been collecting his volume ever since 1939); the papers were usually circulated and criticised within the Commission which signs the report and many of the contributors in each volume had at least intermittent personal contact with others of the writers in the post-war years.

Their aim is succinctly set out in the *general preface*, identical in each volume, contributed by Dr L. Hodgson. The volume *The Nature of the Church* was originally conceived as the third in a series, the first being a series of papers on the doctrine of the Church in Scripture, and the second a survey of the history of the doctrine from sub-apostolic time to the present. War and its aftermath combined with the generic weakness of theologians in prompt correspondence to defeat Dr Flew in his plan. So the present collection of statements on the doctrine of the Church as held today has a little the air of epilogue without story. The editorial preface makes two further points which are of importance in assessing the value of the volume: (i) the volume 'consists of two main divisions: the first planned and carried out from Great Britain as a centre, with documents speaking for the churches of Europe; and the second, from the United States, by the American Theological Committee of which Dr G. W. Richards was the chairman, with Dean Clarence T. Craig summarising the results in his report'. (ii) 'It has been the ambition of the editor to produce statements for Part I which have behind them much more than the authority of a single writer. This aim has been achieved with one significant exception'. Dr Flew goes on to explain that, e.g., Professor Alivisatos' article was approved with 'full satisfaction' by the Archbishop and the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece, that the Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist and Quaker statements were all in various ways endorsed or authorised by appropriate councils of the several churches, and so on. The exception is the statement on the Church of Rome. No Roman Catholic author could be found willing and authorised to furnish it, so that, after protracted negotiations, Dr Flew was compelled to write it himself on the basis of authoritative Papal utterances and other official documents.

The effect of the first consideration, the origins simultaneously from, as it were, Cambridge, England and Cambridge, Mass., is that the volume contains two books of rather different character. To deal with the American part first, since it was prior in time of compilation, it is no slight to the 'Denominational Statements' which follow to say that the outstanding contribution in it is Dr Craig's 'Report of the American Theological Committee'. He analyses the substance of the discussion represented by the subsequent papers under four heads: (1) the historical beginnings of the Christian Church; (2) the norm or standard of authority for the Church; (3) unity and diversity in Christian history; (4) the function of the organised Church. The whole essay is a masterly exercise in clear analysis and comparison. But the total effect of Part II is to leave this reviewer in agreement with the reviewer (himself an American who has worked for the last few years in Europe) who writes in the April number of the *Ecumenical Review*: 'There is a striking difference between the theological atmosphere of it and that of the European section. For instance, the scant attention given to the theology of the Body of Christ, the qualifications attached to acceptance of the authority of Jesus, the presentation of Christ's primary aim as being "to face individuals with an absolute ethic", which one finds in the report of the American committee would have little support in European circles. . . . one is tempted to say that the Atlantic Ocean is one of the most impressive divisive forces which these papers reveal.' The present reviewer is fortified in his conviction that there was a smouldering American dissatification with the report on the Church at Amsterdam which never really broke into blaze; it will be greatly to the health of ecumenical discussion if it becomes fully manifest at Lund.

To return across the Atlantic, in a short review it is impossible to do more than pick out from this mass of material one or two points which appeal to the reviewer. First, Professor Alivisatos' paper admirably illustrates at once the traditional intransigeance of the Eastern Orthodox claim to be the Catholic Church and the new perspectives which Orthodoxy is learning to recognise by mere participation in the ecumenical conversation, and which compel the Eastern Church to admit that 'unwillingly she has become one among the Churches, fully aware of the fact that the largest part of Christianity is outside the remaining part of the One Church' (p.

51). Secondly, the series of papers on the Lutheran and Reformed positions (Schlink and Skydsgaard for the latter) reveal a similar paradox. On the one hand the generally admitted confessional-*ism* of recent years is fully evident in the serious exposition of the classical confessions; on the other hand, these confessions are now read *within* the ecumenical movement in such a way that they are no longer merely texts to be defended but living witnesses which challenge existing forms of church life in the name of a Church which none, *per se*, exemplifies. Such self-criticism is powerfully voiced in the essay by Edmund Schlink. Thirdly, the Church of England statement, drafted by Dr Hodgson after painstaking conference with six other representatives of widely differing Anglican positions, gives a picture based upon the Anglican formularies not easily found elsewhere. It admirably illustrates the Anglican ability to draw divergent deductions from the same sources but perhaps shows once more that one cannot demonstrate on paper why the living community which draws them can legitimately be called one Church. The statements by the Baptists, Congregationalists, Friends and Methodists have (as has been mentioned) no individual authorship but carry the authority of the various representative bodies which endorsed them. As ever, representativeness seems sadly incompatible with sparkle (though individuals can succeed in being even duller). The article on the Church of South India is bound to be of unique interest and is properly modest in its claims whilst containing a moving testimony to the quickened spiritual life and theological vigour which spring from discussing these matters within a newly-won unity instead of round the table of negotiations between separate 'churches'.

In one sense, the significance of the volume on *Ways of Worship* lies in what it leaves out. Professor van der Leeuw, the chairman of the Commission, was a very unrepresentative Dutch churchman. The editorial preface contains a moving memoir to a genius who died before he saw the fruit of this particular manifestation of his many interests, but the report (pp. 15-40 of the volume) still bears the marks of his vivid personality, which no amount of corporate discussion could quite eliminate. But the commission membership (pp. 13-14) contains many names over which the heads of more 'representative' members of various churches will wag sadly. Similarly with the essays which the three editors have selected from amongst the mass of material submitted to the Commission. True, one or two papers (especially the American ones) stand out as being strangely out of harmony with the main lines of the Report and of the volume as a whole. But, by and large, the volume reflects either the explicit liturgiology of the main 'catholic' traditions (including two Roman contributions) or the more or less rebellious liturgical movements within the 'protestant' tradition. Even with contributions from Max Thurian (French Reformed), W. D. Maxwell (Scotland), Julius Schweizer (Switzerland), Wilhelm Stählin (German Lutheran) and various others, the volume as a whole does not answer the question of what worship means within a really thorough-going Protestant-Reformed tradition. This is the more regrettable because of the widespread suspicion shared by many beyond the late Dr van der Leeuw and the three editors, that if worship is taken truly seriously, it radically calls into question some of the most characteristically 'protestant' traditions and demands the re-admission, or at least the revaluation, of certain characteristically 'catholic' conceptions. The prominence here given to the Eucharist as the norm of weekly (and indeed of all) worship, the meaning of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the mystical element in religion, the Communion of Saints and especially the place of the Blessed Virgin, and much else with similar associations, certainly makes the book 'unrepresentative' of millions of Christians associated in the World Council of Churches.

But the volume in its present form raises a double challenge: (1) how far do our denominational divisions spring from far deeper levels than consciously articulated doctrines? (2) how far do those deeper sources of difference already cause divergences *within* the existing pattern of our churches which will either disrupt the present pattern or else demonstrate that such divergences are meant to be held in fruitful tension within a life of organic unity?

A more 'representative' book would probably have been a duller one and the present volume will be abundantly justified if it drives the Faith and Order movement into accepting a far more thorough, patient and sustained attempt to bring separated Christians together at the level of worship. This will involve, as the Commission discovered and as the final essay by Shaw and Hayman suggests, a new technique of ecumenical meeting in which we talk less and pray more. That in itself could hardly fail to be gain.

The volume on *Intercommunion* shares the achievement and the frustration of the Report, which has already been published and is re-printed at the beginning of the book. The achievement is certainly to have made available as never before an analysis of the problem and an understanding of the motives which underlie various attitudes to it. The frustration lies in the impossibility of speaking any truly healing word to this painful situation.

After the Report, Part II consists of four historical papers, which at least make clear that the problem, for all its apparent stark simplicity, is a veritable chameleon which has changed colour with every situation in which it has been set.

Part III consists of fifteen individual 'contributions to the present discussions'. An *Amica Contestatio* by Father Congar sets out with characteristic charity and clarity, why the whole discussion is, for a Roman Catholic, a fundamentally mistaken argument. 'When unity is given, it is not of intercommunion that we should speak, but quite simply of Communion. At present we are, and very really, united *in Christ* . . . but we are not united in One Church . . . until (we are) intercommunion is, alas, impossible.' There are various contributions from different traditions (Methodist, Rupert Davies; Disciples ('the non-clerical tradition'), A. T. de Groot; Baptist, Devadutt and P. W. Evans; German Evangelical, Niesel; and so on). There are two interesting Anglican contributions: 'a personal opinion' by S. L. Greenslade, distinguishing between the necessities for re-union and for intercommunion and pleading that they are already present for the latter to be possible in a wider area including Anglicanism; the essay by L. Hodgson explains and justifies the present regulations based upon Lambeth Resolutions but suggesting that the same theological principles demand an occasional but *reciprocal* intercommunion. Father Hebert's essay is an interesting study in signs of a growing mutual understanding between those who lay stress on the Ministry of the Word and on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but since that is also an intra-Anglican development, it is hardly decisive for intercommunion. One of the most pregnant contributions is that by T. F. Torrance on 'Eschatology and the Eucharist'. There are appendices: *A.* analyses the 'Existing Rules and Customs of the Churches'; *B.* is a reprinting (though without committing the Commission to endorsing the practice) of Ian Thomson's 'Revival of the Agape'.

The stage is set for the Lund Conference. With the publication of these volumes the principal material for consideration is before the churches. An assessment of the material as a whole would call for even more space than this review occupies. All that may be ventured in conclusion is a suggestion that the Faith and Order movement stands at a new crisis. This material makes clear that over forty years of work have resulted in a volume of analytical literature which is not likely by itself to solve our problems. We need now to press on, armed with this knowledge, along three paths:

(1) to carry even deeper a theological 'digging' which has already shown that every single important issue is at some point *trans*-confessional in the alignment it causes;

(2) to allow the 'non-theological factors' (touched upon in the

Report on the Church) to be fearlessly faced in their implications for our theological and denominational divisions;

(3) to discover new means (hinted at in the *Ways of Worship* volume) to confront each other at deeper levels than mere debate. Not least, these new possibilities may be found by accepting more radically the new relationship to each other offered by our common life in the World Council of Churches itself.

God certainly offers fresh opportunities to break old deadlocks. The only uncertainty is whether we shall have the grace of obedience to follow where He leads.

Oliver Tomkins

Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin II, 1951. Oxonian Press Ltd. 50 pages.

Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas is an international society of NT scholars; and this Bulletin makes available the four main papers given at the General Meeting of the Society in Oxford, during September 1951. There is also a short note about the General Meeting itself. Copies of the Bulletin may be obtained on application to the Oxonian Press, 29 Queen Street, Oxford, at 5/6 each, post free—payment to be made with the order.

The first paper, 'A Problem of Interpretation', is Professor C. H. Dodd's presidential address. Professor Dodd pleads that the modern theological interpretation of the Bible should not overlook the importance of the historical criticism of the Biblical documents. Since Biblical revelation was revelation in and through historical events 'the more seriously we aim at a theological interpretation of the Bible, the more important it is that we should study it historically' (p. 18).

Professor P. H. Menoud, in discussing 'The Western Text and the Theology of Acts', treats both the Alexandrian and Western texts as recensions of a more primitive text; and reveals some of the theological tendencies reflected in the Western readings. A paper by Professor H. F. D. Sparks, headed 'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the N.T.', reminds us that Semitism in the Greek of the NT may not always be the result of translation from Aramaic or Hebrew sources. A fourth contribution by Professor A. M. Ramsay, entitled 'What was the Ascension?' concludes that theologically the doctrines of the Resurrection and the Ascension were different doctrines in the apostolic church; but 'as to an *event* of Ascension distinct from the event of the Resurrection, the allusions to the Ascension in the apostles' preaching and letters give almost no hint that it was a separate historical event' (p. 50).

G. H. Boobyer

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH[1]

by THE REV. T. W. GARDINER

IT WAS significant of H. R. Mackintosh and his whole theological position that he made his class for the preparation of sermons a part of his course in theology. He often declared that the test of theology is whether it will preach well. When we first heard it, it may not have carried conviction. But experience taught us how true it is.

Professor Mackintosh considered that the task of theology was to assist the proclamation of the Gospel. In his eyes theology was not an academic study but a practical one, because the Gospel is not so much the explanation of life as the cure of its disorder. It was his duty as a theologian to explain and justify the doctrine of the Church. But he never forgot that it would be the duty of his students when they became ministers of the Church to translate that doctrine into proclamation and appeal. If such preaching carried conviction and strengthened faith, then the theology behind it would be justified. To take an example—he used to draw a distinction between the positive and negative sides of the doctrine of election. He argued that the positive form of the doctrine is a conviction of believing experience. It declares that faith rests upon the grace of God which was directed towards the believer before ever he responded to it, and that he can count upon it to sustain him to the end. That, he said, provides a theme for preaching well fitted to give assurance when faith is hard pressed. On the other hand the negative form of the doctrine which points to unbelief as a sign of God's rejection has no basis in the experience of the believer and is therefore unwarranted. That is shown by the fact that the preaching of such a doctrine would induce fatalism and irresponsibility. That is but one example of how preaching tests theology. His point of view on this matter was characteristic. He was not given to speculation and had little patience with scholasticism. He considered, as he said, that 'theology is not so much a creative as an interpretative study'. At any rate he regarded it as his duty to interpret Christian experience, to bring faith to full self-consciousness but always that its convictions might be made known with effect.

---

[1] Address to New College Union on 4th October 1951.

Furthermore he never spoke of the Gospel as a neutral observer keeping an open mind till adequate proof was forthcoming. He always spoke of it as an advocate of faith, as a believing man to whom its truth had been verified not before he had accepted it but after he had committed himself to it. As he said in speaking of religious doubt, 'Life is a bigger thing by far than logic and formal reasoning. What we cannot see through, we can live through.' And he would have justified such an attitude by saying that the Gospel does not consist in ideas to be grasped by the mind but in a personal relationship to be chosen by the will. As he said in another place, 'through loyalty to light—that is the great principle for all who are steering forward through the mists of doubt'. That too is the reason why he so frequently used friendship as the best illustration of religious faith, though he recognised, of course, that not even friendship can be a real parallel to God's revelation of Himself, but it is a pointer in the right direction. The words 'existential' and 'encounter' were not in those days current coin in theological speech as they have since become, but though he did not use the words he well understood the truth for which they stand. When the Gospel which is personal through and through, because Christ is central in it, confronts a man who takes life seriously, it calls not for argument concerning its truth but for decision on its worth. Commitment and choice must precede verification. After that initial surrender has been made experience will give understanding and will supply the proof.

In that class for sermon preparation he had much wise advice to give regarding the manner of preaching. He had a curious notion that the tenth minute of a sermon is a crucial point. He was generous enough to believe that people will bear with a preacher for ten minutes. But if he cannot say something to arrest their attention at that point he has lost them for good and all. Needless to say, however, he thought it unwise to presume on people's patience, so he used to warn us not to prolong introductory remarks on a text but to get down to the business of expounding it without delay. He quoted Dr Stalker as an example to follow, who he said had been heard to give out his text, state the heads of his sermon and immediately begin on the first one. He also recommended that we take special care with the conclusion of a sermon. At that point there must be no trusting to the impulse of the moment. Whether the whole sermon was written or not the end of it must be. He also advised us not to hesitate to address a congregation as 'you'. The young preacher may feel that it is more fitting if he range himself with his people by using the word 'we'. But he did not approve of that. At some point the preacher must address people directly and utter God's claim upon them personally. Another piece of advice he gave us was that quotations in sermons should be brief. And that leads on to what he had to say about illustrations. He laid it down that there is no copyright in illustrations. You can get them from any source.

But to move on from the manner of preaching to the Gospel to be preached, let me quote a characteristic sentence: 'To part with the glory and wonder of this faith (he has been speaking of the pre-existence of our Lord) is in a grave measure to part with the native joy of the Christian religion; and to remove the scene of sacrifice from heaven to earth will inevitably stimulate the less worthy impulse felt at some time by all to preach about man instead of God.' In two respects that quotation is typical of his attitude to the Gospel.

In the first place, he never ceased to dwell upon its wonder. That impression was left on my mind by all he said of it. Indeed in his judgment this is the touchstone of every interpretation of it—does it retain the sense of wonder that fills the New Testament? In writing of Kierkegaard he says that 'he bids us recollect that any form of the Christian Gospel which has parted with the element of wonder is fatally untrue to type'. That expressed his own view. In the memorial volume of sermons published after his death there is one on Wonder and Religion. He recalls how that chord is often struck in scripture revealing 'the astonished mind of the believer and giving a note of exhilaration to his voice'. He also pointed out that the hymn book is full of the same atmosphere. The mention of the hymn book reminds me that he often urged us to use the hymns of the Church to help theological understanding. In them faith finds utterance in praise and adoration which can alone match the wonder it celebrates. The wonder he rejoiced in was not the wonder that awakens the intellectual curiosity of scientist or philosopher. It was the wonder of the man of faith whose whole being has found rest in the Divine love and peace that passeth knowledge.

In the second place, it was characteristic of him that he should have said that preaching must always be about God, not about man. That has been much emphasised since he urged it on us. But he was insistent that God is the author of faith, and that the believer attains faith in the living God by reason of God's action on his soul. He instinctively reacted against the idea that man reaches Christian faith as the result of a process initiated by his desire to find God. That would suggest a movement from man to God, in which man with his hopes and fears would take the chief place. In his opinion that would invert the course of what takes place. Faith, he said, was not something that man possessed by virtue of his manhood which he can cultivate by a course of self-development. Rather is faith bestowed on man as a gift of God's grace. He believed in a theology of crisis in which the transcendence of God is conserved. That was the theme of his book entitled *The Divine Initiative*. The argument of that book is summarised in the sentence: 'It is God who takes the first step that man might take the second.' What God has done is basic. It cannot be fitted into any process in which man is central. It adds to the immanent possibilities within man the creative art of God, who, in St. Paul's words, 'calls into being what does not exist'. On any lesser terms than that the Gospel would not awaken the adoring wonder it does in the believing heart.

It is by His revelation of Himself that God calls faith into being. There is, of course, a general revelation given to all men in nature and conscience. Professor Mackintosh had no hesitation in acknowledging that it provides men with a true knowledge of God's power and righteousness. But manifestly they need more than what general revelation can give them if they are to grasp the fact that they are dependent on God alone for truth concerning Himself. They need something else, and it is provided in the special Biblical Revelation on which Christian faith rests. It is a story of events, and of people called of God to make known the inner meaning of such events. It finds its completion in God's self-disclosure of Himself in the Person of our Lord. He was called of God to be the Saviour of mankind. The cause He was called to serve was so completely His own that it constituted as it were His personality. His Divine vocation was just Himself.

That was a point continually emphasised by Professor Mackintosh. In Revelation he did not find ideas about God, still less propositions concerning Him to which the assent of the mind was demanded. What he found was God personally present making on us the impression that one person makes on another. If that is true of Biblical revelation as a whole it is of course specially true of the perfect form of that revelation in the person of our Lord. Let me quote three passages from his books which make clear how much he valued this insight.

'The faith conveyed by Jesus is no mere abstract truth separable from Himself as the truth of the law of gravitation is separable from Newton. The highest and purest faith in God comes through a believing response to the person of Jesus Christ.' Again 'it is not possible to doubt the reality of God once we have known One in whom God is recognisably present, drawing us into fellowship with Himself.' And the following words put the truth in the briefest and simplest terms: 'A world with Jesus in it, is a world with a loving God over it.' In these words the human Jesus is fully identified with God. The Incarnation was to him the precious truth that in our Lord we are confronted with 'God's presence and His very self'. In Him we have the gift of God in person, and that makes God's revelation of Himself fully personal. On that conviction of faith his reading of all doctrine concerning Christ's person was based. He often spoke of revelation as what is 'given' us by God. In Christ that 'givenness' of revelation is manifested in perfect form. Here, he would have said, God is everything and offers all. 'Where is boasting then? It is excluded.' Man's part is to come 'with empty hands', a phrase he often used, and accept in wondering humility what is offered him.

This being so, revelation, as it is in Christ, cannot be apprehended by the mind alone. He would have said that an intellectual approach to Christ is not in place. He makes an impact on our personality as a whole. He put it this way, 'to ask for proof that what shines to us through Christ is God, is like asking for proof that luminous objects are visible'. In general revelation given in nature and conscience there is a place for inference and reasoning. In the fully personal form of revelation given in our Lord that is not so. 'He is His own best evidence.' We either see the wonder and the worth of what is given us in Him and welcome it in humility, or it remains hidden from us because we prefer to analyse it with our mind. The fulness of God in Christ can only be apprehended if we approach Him with all that is within us, ready for surrender.

It follows from all this that our Lord must be regarded as the object of faith. That was a point which he often stressed as against what he called 'the obstinate contention that Jesus is but the example of faith, not in strictness its object'. In one of his books he distinguished between a reduced or diluted form of Christianity and full Christian faith. What he meant by the former was an interpretation of the Gospel story which regards our Lord as but the first Christian, the greatest example of trust in the Heavenly Father. If that be so then it is our duty to imitate Him and copy His faith. But, he asked, if the Gospel is turned into the demand that we practise a faith like that of Jesus what is that but an added burden, so that the Gospel becomes no more than a new Judaism, not the deliverance that it has always been believed to be? Full Christianity, on the other hand, has always regarded Christ as a Divine Saviour in whom God is personally present to save us from sin and death. If that be so, then we are asked not to believe like Jesus but to believe in Him. It is personal commitment to Him in love and trust that is demanded of us. In the one case we are asked to attempt a task manifestly beyond us, but we are left with our independence which we value so much. In the other we are asked to give up our rights over ourselves and commit ourselves to Christ. It is a costly demand to make on a creature so self-willed as man. But it is the way to blessedness through indebtedness which arouses wonder in the believing heart.

Seeing that Christian faith is belief in Christ and personal surrender to Him it finds its fulfilment in the union of the believer with Christ, the mystical union. As Professor Mackintosh saw it, the characteristic of personality is not individual isolation but the power of self-communication resulting in fellowship. He claimed that such personal union of the believer with Christ is set forth in the New Testament, and especially in the Pauline Epistles and the Johannine Writings. All Christianity resides in the companion truths: 'God in Christ for us, we in Christ for God', another of those simple and concise statements by which he summarised his point of view. For himself he declared that this thought, 'God in Christ for us', helped him to understand some things about the Christian life which would otherwise be inscrutable. He used it, for instance, to shed light on the mystery of our Lord's nature. 'To impart Himself to men so that they can hold fellowship with Him as with their own souls, this is a capacity which we can only interpret as Divine.' He also used it to help him to understand the atonement. 'We in Christ for God', that enables us in some measure to see why the believer, despite unworthiness, is forgiven and restored 'for Christ's sake'. At any rate it lifts the matter above all legal categories and makes it fully personal. The legal is all too rational and for that very reason is out of place in this connexion. The personal cannot be rationalised and therefore is in accord with an experience that evades the rational and finds itself at home amidst wonder and mystery.

I have just referred to the atonement and the forgiveness of sin. That was the subject of which he spoke most often and on it he wrote his most impressive book. The experience of forgiveness brought into high relief the meaning of the Gospel, so that all he had to say about the Gospel he said with greater force when he spoke of forgiveness.

The Gospel is wonderful. The most wonderful thing in it is the forgiveness of sins. 'That the abyss between the Holy Father and us the sinful should have been crossed from the further side, this is nothing but a strange and unimaginable miracle. We cannot measure it, but we can drink in life from the thought of it, and its wonder we can sing.' Forgiveness cannot be explained by any powers within man. It must be an act of God. Speaking of those who have received pardon he said, 'God has invaded their being in a fashion which neither nature nor human nature can account for, in a power that transcends nature and for ends that lie beyond it. This is the supernatural.'

We have seen that Professor Mackintosh always spoke of our Lord as one in whom God was personally present to seek and save us. He is more than a messenger from God. In Him God's holy love for the sinful is operative among us. This is how he described what he saw in Christ. 'In what He undergoes at Calvary Jesus is not merely reporting or indicating a Divine Love beyond Himself. Rather by being what He is in circumstances He Himself had chosen, He is bringing in God's love upon us and making it ours.'

Why had our Lord to die in order that forgiveness might be conveyed to the sinful? If God is merciful and ready to receive the sinner would it not be enough were the good news to be communicated to mankind by compassion and in parable? Why the need of the bitter Cross? In answering that question he gave this warning: 'We suppose that the reason why we fail to understand the atonement is that our minds are not profound enough. The real reason is that we are not good enough.' As he said of a famous saying, 'that is the lightning flash that clears the air'. 'We are not good enough to understand the atonement.' We cannot understand the Divine Forgiveness, so full and free, because in our imperfect human way we never forgive completely. And we never forgive completely because we dare not bear the cost of such forgiveness. Our Lord did so to the uttermost. The atonement manifests for all to see what it costs to forgive as God forgives. The cost was not endured to induce God to show mercy to the sinful. No, for as Professor Mackintosh said: 'The love of the Father is the fount of all redemption. The atonement is the manner necessary to His love in which His pardon is given.' The manner had to be costly if His holy love were to be made known.

He gave the same answer to the ever recurring argument that the Gospel offer of forgiveness may lessen moral responsibility and induce presumption. But as he said, 'provided the nature and cost of the Divine pardon be realised, the effect ought to be of an opposite kind'. And all through his book he developed a powerful argument to show that the experience of forgiveness summons to action motives for goodness in comparison with which the precepts of the moralist are paltry, provided always that the cost of forgiveness has humbled the sinner to a true repentance. It is the humility induced by submitting to forgiveness at such great cost that constrains the sinner to turn his will to what is right. If pride and the love of self be the cause of sin the dethronement of self that God may reign is the secret of the good life. To quote once more: 'The morality that revolves round self has upon it the sentence of death. But to owe everything to God is to have taken the first decisive step to escape from self-absorption.' And in another place it was a delight to him to cite in detail all the manifold ethical impulses which rise spontaneously out of the experience of being forgiven 'for Christ's sake', 'impulses', he said, 'more fertile of goodness than can be found anywhere else'. And the curious thing is this, that 'the production of morality is not the purpose of forgiveness. Yet it is strictly the fact that the ethical influence of pardon is all the more fruitful in that its aim is not to affect character but to restore our personal relationship with God'. This means that forgiveness is a religious rather than a moral experience in which morality is both transcended and fulfilled. Moral responsibility we can understand. The moral law is clear and definite. Yet if taken seriously it always leads to a troubled conscience which compels the cry: 'What lack I yet?' As he said: 'Morality sends out the S.O.S. It is God the Redeemer who can hear and answer.' God's answer to the problem of guilt rising out of earnest moral effort, is, as God's answers always are to every problem, beyond our understanding. It leads us again into the realm of wonder where we can but know in part but where faith is vindicated because life is enriched. 'What the law could not do, God effected by sending His Son.'

To pass to another point—one who took the view, as Professor Mackintosh did, that the reason why the Gospel should be studied by the scholar was that it might be more effectively proclaimed by the evangelist, was sure to be an advocate of the world-mission of the Church. His theological position was one that maintained the character of Christianity as being a Gospel, the announcement of good tidings about God. It is as a Gospel that Christianity claims to be the religion for all mankind, and he was confident that it could sustain such a claim. In the memorial volume of sermons published after his death, which shows so admirably those aspects of the faith that were uppermost in his mind, there is one on Foreign Missions. I mention it not because it is one of his most memorable sermons but because it makes clear that he gave his heart and mind to this essential work of the Church. He frequently quoted the testimony of missionaries in defence of some point he was defending. He specially enjoyed the saying of one of our missionaries of a former generation, 'to make a sound Christian of a Hindu, you have got to convert his grandmother'. It so intrigued him that he used it in different contexts. He once said that sufficient use had not as yet been made of what he called 'the theological suggestiveness of missionary experience'. In 1920 he published his book, *The Originality of the Christian Message*, in which he entered the field of Comparative Religion, a subject in which the missionary has so vital an interest.

At the beginning of that book he quoted the saying of a missionary that 'he had never preached the Gospel anywhere without finding that God had been there before him'. He used it to support the view that we must not think of Christianity as 'an isolated thing—truth in sheer contrast to ethnic lies—but as the climax and crown of other faiths in their nobler meaning'. At the time he wrote that, many people looked upon the relation of Christianity to other religions in that way. For instance in 1913 a very notable book on Christianity and Hinduism was published with the title *The Crown of Hinduism*. Such a view rests upon the assumption that a religion such as Hinduism serves as a preparation for the Gospel. That in its turn implies that the similarities between Christianity and a non-Christian faith are such that there can be, as it were, a continuous passage from one to the other. Such reasoning can be carried so far as to conceal the differences between Christianity and a religion like Hinduism and to reach the conclusion that both are expressions of a universal religious consciousness latent in humanity. This would amount to regarding the Gospel as the crown of general revelation, whereas it is the crown not of general revelation but of the special Biblical Revelation.

Needless to say, Professor Mackintosh would never have allowed himself to be led to any such conclusion as this. By the time he wrote the lecture on Ernst Troeltsch, published in *Types of Modern Theology*, his own view of revelation had asserted itself. He realised that on Troeltsch's presuppositions there is no place for special revelation. All is but general revelation, and Christianity, distinctive though it be, is but one more, expressive of the spiritual life immanent in humanity.

He put it like this in one of his vivid pictures, 'in spring the fresh leaves differ minutely in size or conformation; yet they are all similar buds on a tree whose roots go down into an earthly soil'. He saw that if Troeltsch and all who think like him had their way missionary work would lose its old motive and acquire a new aim. The new aim would be 'to effect an understanding, and, in some form, a synthesis of Christianity with the highest ethnic faiths'. On that matter he well said, 'you cannot name a colour made up of all the colours there are' which is as good an answer as can be given to all who advocate syncretism because they belittle the special character of Biblical Revelation. As against any such view of the task of the future, he repeated what he had said previously in *The Divine Initiative*, which it is significant to note was originally given as lectures at a theological school for missionaries. This is how he had spoken to them about their aim and task: 'If Christianity is only a matter of general spiritual truths or universal moral ideals it by no means follows that the missionary is able to propose to non-Christians anything specifically new. On the other hand, just in so far as he has to tell of certain Divine events, or to present a certain Divine Personality, all that he says is new. Here he gives only, and does not receive.' Such counsel is never superfluous in the case of missionaries to India where it is so easy to become enveloped in the smoke screen that Hinduism has such a genius for spreading abroad.

As for the finality of the Gospel which is such an offence to all who interpret religion in terms of human development rather than of Divine Initiative he admitted that it is impossible to prove it. It is an act of faith and faith does not ask for proof before it makes its venture. It is satisfied if subsequently experience proves it right. This is what he wrote on this matter: 'It is only through the perpetual conflict of missionary enterprise that the Church can keep its great assurance that Christianity is ultimate. Were it to despair of the missionary cause it would instantly lose that life-giving insight. Christianity, in short, is absolute if it dare to be so. The persuasion of its supremacy is not something that can be attained once and for all, entered correctly in a creed and left to maintain itself in life and power. No, we lose the truth except as we continually regain it.'

That long quotation tells us something about faith which I believe meant much to him. He repeatedly said that the difficulties that beset faith are so great that we can expect no rest. To hold the faith at all, we must constantly be winning it anew. His great friend Dr A. B. Macaulay wrote of him: 'My impression is that he never passed through an agonising period of intellectual doubt regarding Christianity.' That is probably true if due weight is given to the word period. But he may well have had many a moment of doubt notwithstanding. As he said in one of his sermons: 'There is a sceptic hidden away in every devout heart. It is the deadliest foe and the longest lived.' That adds poignancy to another thing he said: 'We possess faith only as under God we fight and recapture it daily.' Faith is not assent to abstract truth that is so well proved that we cannot help believing it and storing it in the mind. Being personal, faith is a living thing exposed to all that assails life yet ever drawing strength for survival from the Living One on whom it trusts. Faith is always a fight, a fight for life, a good fight. We have every reason to believe that he fought it to the end and won.

WORD AND DEED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT[1]

by THE LATE REV. PROFESSOR J. D. A. MACNICOL

THE main theme of this paper is that, whereas in general, Greek thought sharply distinguishes and indeed opposes the notion of 'word' and the notion of 'act', the thought of the Old Testament so closely associates the two that it can use one term for both; and further that while traces of the Greek attitude are certainly to be found in the New Testament, yet it is the OT attitude which is dominant. It will be maintained that recognition of this fact is of the utmost importance for the understanding of NT thought in general, and in particular is relevant to an understanding of the NT view of (1) God and History, (2) The Incarnation.

In his fascinating book *The Aztecs of Mexico* the late George Clapp Vaillant writes: 'The Indians did not have the same goals in life as we have, so that their pattern of life is different from our own and difficult to understand.' And although we are in part the heirs of the Hebrews we likewise often find Hebrew ways of thought difficult to understand. It is the Greeks rather than the Hebrews who have moulded our present modes of thinking. But in the NT it is Hebrew modes of thinking that are dominant, so that if we are to understand the NT, we must make the painful effort of sympathetic imagination which is involved in thinking ourselves into the different Hebrew way, one aspect of which is illustrated in the present study. Let us take one instance.

In the account of the relations of Peter and Cornelius which is given in the Acts of the Apostles, there occurs in 10.15 and again in 11.9 the phrase *Ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε σὺ μὴ κοίνου*. In both occurrences the A.V. renders, 'What God hath cleansed, that *call* not thou common', while the R.V. has, 'What God hath cleansed *make* not thou common'. It is very doubtful whether the revisers understood the words in any way differently from their predecessors. Why then should they vary the language? Might it be suggested that the earlier translators, observing that the words of 10.28 καὶ ἐμοὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἔδειξε μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον ('and God has showed me not to *call* any man common or unclean') show clearly the sense in which those of 10.15 are to be taken, were willing to render κοίνου in a way which that word's classical usage would not permit; while the revisers, being more sensitive to the proprieties of Classical Greek, salved their consciences by using a rendering which appeared at any rate to preserve the strictly causative sense of the verb κοινόω, although in fact it did not alter the sense? At any rate it is now perfectly clear that in these two passages the verb κοινόω does *not* mean 'make common' but as the A.V. correctly translated 'call common' or 'declare common'. And the reason why it can and does mean this is beyond a shadow of doubt because, as Liddell and Scott point out, there is here a Semitism, and the meaning of κοινόω is determined in this case not by classical Greek usage but by the fact that the Hebrew טמא (following a common usage of both Piel and Hiphil) can mean either 'defile' (e.g. Lev. 15.31 *et al.*) or 'declare unclean' (Lev. 13.3, 8, 11); or perhaps one should rather say means *both* 'defile' *and* 'declare unclean'.

---

[1] Paper read on 15th May 1951, and reprinted from the *Australian Biblical Review*, vol. 1-2.

This difference of Greek and Hebrew usage we shall now proceed to examine more closely.

Two possible misconceptions should be guarded against here. We may not maintain that the association of the declaratory and the factitive notion is peculiar to Hebrew usage; it is not. Nor is any judgment necessarily implied on the question whether Hebrew is at this point a more 'primitive' language than Greek, and is merely failing to draw a distinction which a more 'sophisticated' culture finds necessary. What is being said is that on the whole these different ways of thinking, and consequently these different grammatical usages, are in fact characteristic of Biblical Hebrew on the one hand, and classical Greek on the other, and that as a matter of history, whereas it is by the usages of classical Greek that our own thinking is largely determined, the usages of Biblical Hebrew provide a key to many things in the thought of the NT.

The typical Greek view of the relation of speech and action is well seen in the λόγῳ μὲν . . . ἔργῳ δέ antithesis. It may be arguable that in the early period which is represented for us by Homer words were sometimes viewed as, so to speak, vested with power (as opposed to '*mere*' words). So in Od. 19.565 *ἔπεα ἀκράαντα* are opposed to *ἔπεα ἔτυμα* as though perhaps the true nature of a word is a word fulfilled; but whether this was so or not, by the classical period it seems clear that whatever term was used to denote speech, that speech was sharply opposed to action. As Liddell and Scott (7th edit.) summarise the matter in the article *λόγος*: 'it is opposed to *ἔργον*, as a thing *merely uttered and not made good*, *λόγος ἔργου σκιά*, Democrit. *ap. Philon.* 1.615.' It is immediately obvious that this antithesis reflects the common Greek dualism of form and matter which appears in so many different ways—in the negation of the flesh expressed by the *σῶμα-σῆμα* view of life; in the philosophy of Plato; and in the common assumptions which made it so difficult a task for the Christian Church a little later to formulate in Greek terms a doctrine of Christ's person which should not deny either His humanity or His divinity. To say the same thing in a different way, it is clear that this *λόγος-ἔργον* antithesis is a natural and indeed inevitable expression of the analytic type of thinking which characterised the Greek mind and which consequently tended to express itself in terms of abstractions. Whether this is a valid way of thinking about reality, and if so what the limits of that validity are, is not at present the issue. We are concerned simply to note that the Greek mind did in fact think in this way.

The Hebrew mind on the other hand seems to have thought in quite a different way. To say this and to speak of the Hebrew type of thinking as synthetic is the merest commonplace. Nevertheless it may be doubted whether the significance of the fact is sufficiently grasped in its relation to NT thought.

Pedersen remarks (*Israel, its Life and Culture*, E.T., vol. I-II, pp. 167-8): 'No distinction is made between the word and the matter described, and consequently the Hebrew denominations of a word may just as well apply to the matter.' This holds good both of *abr* and '*mr*. The most ordinary term for 'word', *dābhār*, also implies an action, that which happens, the event with all that it implies (Gen. 15.1, 22.20); it is said: make a *dābhār* (Gen. 20.10, 22.16, 44.7). Abraham's servant who returned with Rebekah told Isaac, 'All the *d*^{e}*bhārīm* he had made'

(Gen. 24.66); it means all he had said, done, heard, and experienced. The word means an affair, a matter and all the circumstances attached to it. It is used in a perfectly concrete manner about that which is. When Yahweh killed the cattle of the Egyptians, no *dābhār* of that of the Israelites was killed (Exod. 9.4). (The LXX renders here by *ῥητόν*, by the way, quite properly, but also, for the classical Hellenist, quite impossibly. How could an ox possibly be described as a 'statement'?) In the same manner *'ōmer* is used (Job 22.28): 'If thou decide *'ōmer*, it shall be established unto thee.'

'For the Israelites there is upon the whole no difference whatsoever between the idea, the name and the matter itself. It is therefore,' says Pederson elsewhere (p. 167), 'in full agreement with the general view when the Israelites, by the verbal form denoting the causative, do not distinguish between *making* a man into something and *saying* that he is so.'

To summarise these statements briefly one may say that for the OT a true word is *both speech and action.*

Let us turn now to a brief survey of some of the Greek words in the NT which are most relevant to our study. We shall confine ourselves to nouns. The word *ῥητόν* has already been mentioned, and is worth noting although it does not occur in the NT. In the LXX it is used, it will be remembered, to translate דבר in the sense of 'head of cattle' in Exod. 94. Of strictly NT words only two need be considered: *ῥῆμα*, *λόγος*.

It is immediately obvious that the distinctively Hebrew sense of 'word-deed' which attaches to דבר attaches also to *ῥῆμα*, as one would expect, in quotations from the OT, e.g. Matt. 18.16, *ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα* (על-פי שני עדים או על-פי שלשה עדים יקום דבר, from Deut. 19.15, also quoted in 2 Cor. 13); 1 Pet. 1.25, *τὸ δέ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (ודבר אלהינו יקום לעולם, Isa. 40.8). But the notion of 'matter' or 'event' also attaches to the term elsewhere, particularly, as one might again expect, in the Lucan Infancy narratives (*ῥῆμα* occurs four times in this sense in the first two chapters of Luke) and in the early part of Acts, e.g. 5.32, *ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων.* In Acts 13.42 there is an interesting link between this usage and the common Johannine combination *λαλεῖν ῥήματα.* Paul has been preaching in the Synagogue in Pisidian Antioch and after he has finished the gentiles among his audience request that these *ῥήματα* should be recounted to them again the next Sabbath (the verb is *λάλειν*). Moulton and Geden suggest that this also may be an instance of the use of *ῥῆμα* in the sense of matter, action, event—quite plausibly, since although it is *ῥήματα* (i.e. *prima facie*, 'words') that are to be repeated, those 'words' proclaim the *acts* of God in the history of Israel. The mere fact that *ῥήματα* here can (whether accidentally or not) be interpreted thus by these scholars, casts a flood of light on Johannine usage, and makes one see how narrow a line separates the thought of 'word' and 'deed' in other portions of the NT than those which have indisputably a Semitic base; or rather how there is no real line of separation at all. Word and act are one in so far as the word is a true word and in so far as he who speaks is strong.

The term *λόγος* occurs well over three hundred times in the NT and is more generally distributed than *ῥῆμα*. While *ῥῆμα* is noticeably more frequent in John and especially in the Lucan writings, *λόγος* is frequent in all sections of the NT.

As one might expect the ordinary Greek antithesis of *λόγος* and *ἔργον* appears from time to time in the NT, particularly in the writings of Paul, but also in other parts, cf. 2 Cor. 10.11: *οἷοί ἐσμεν τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ*; 1 John 3.18, *μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*. But even as one seeks in the NT for illustrations of this usage some most interesting facts emerge:

(*a*) Even where *λόγος* and *ἔργον* are contrasted in the NT they are often presented rather as complementary to one another than as antithetical. So we have the description of Jesus in Luke 24.19 as *δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ* and the interestingly parallel description of Moses in Acts 7.22. So in 1 Thess. 1.5 we have *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει κτλ*, and similarly in 1 Cor. 4.20 *οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει.*

(*b*) In certain contexts the contrast is not so much between *λόγος* and *ἔργον* as between man's weakness and God's strength. So e.g. in 1 Cor. 2.4, 5 we read: *καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει Πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως. ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾖ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ.*

One sees clearly illustrated here the fact that although Paul is expressing himself in a typically Greek idiom, yet the underlying conception of the nature of words is not Greek but Hebraic. As Pedersen says: 'The word is the form of vesture of the contents of the soul, its bodily expression. Behind the soul stands the whole of the soul which created it. If he who utters a word is a strong soul, then the word expresses more reality than a weak soul can put into it' (*Israel* 1-2.167). And by consequence, if he who utters the word is Almighty God, the word spoken cannot be hindered of its purpose. Thus even where the distinctively Greek *λόγος-ἔργον* antithesis occurs in the NT we find Hebrew conceptions present.

There are also of course very many instances in the NT in which the term *λόγος* seems to signify as it were 'mere' speech and where the usage does not seem to differ from that of ordinary Greek. Of this it is scarcely necessary to give examples.

But at the same time there are also clear instances of the term being used, like *ῥῆμα* and דבר of 'event' or 'matter'. An interesting instance of this occurs in Mark 1.45 when at the close of the incident of the healing of a leper by Jesus and in spite of His strict injunction not to do so, we read that the now cleansed leper proceeded to spread news of the matter far and near: *ὁ δὲ ἐξέλθων ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον*. This instance is interesting because it adds Mark to the list of NT books in which this kind of usage is quite clearly present. There are again instances of the same thing in the Lucan writings, e.g. Luke 9.28, Acts 8.21, 11.22.

Apart however from these indisputable examples of the use of *λόγος* in the sense of 'matter' or 'event' there are many other points at which the NT seems to reflect the OT conception of the nature of words.

(*a*) The mere possibility of the use of verbs like *ποιεῖν* and *τηρεῖν* with *λόγον* in the sense of 'make a word good', i.e. put it into action, while it may not be entirely alien to non-Biblical Greek usage, is certainly not common; whereas it is exceedingly common in the NT. The obvious explanation is that whereas it is not easy to see how one can 'do' a 'mere' word, it is very easy to see how one can do something which combines the notions of 'word' and 'deed', i.e., in short, something more or less equivalent to דבר.

(*b*) Phrases like *πλάστοις λόγοις* (2 Pet. 2.2) and *κένοις λόγοις* (Eph. 5.6) are by no means impossible in ordinary Greek. But their significance is greatly increased if they are seen as something like the equivalent of the Hebrew 'lip-word' (דבר-שפתים) of the OT. Such phrases imply, that is to say, that a word is not itself unless it is an effective word. The same view of the nature of words may well underlie the phrases *ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* in Mark 7.13 and *ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* in Matt. 15.6.

(*c*) A phrase in the account in Luke (7.1-10) of the curing by Jesus of the Capernaum centurion's servant is very significant. The centurion says to Jesus *εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου.* This seems clearly to imply that as the simple word of God accomplished Creation, so Christ's simple word can accomplish this cure, i.e. the view taken by the Roman centurion of the nature of words is that which is characteristic not of Gentiles but of Jesus. If this is true there is clearly added the point in Jesus' recorded comment, 'I have not found such faith in Israel'.

(*d*) Whatever be the source of the prologue to the third Gospel it is interesting to notice the words *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου* in Luke 1.2, for these words surely imply something closely akin to the use of the term *λόγος* which is found in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, a use which the writer believes to be rooted not in Greek thought, but in the OT.

Still further instances of the way in which the NT reflects the OT view of words will be adduced in the course of our examination of the relevance of this discussion to some leading NT themes, to which we now pass.

1. *God and History*

The whole OT conception of the Living God as continually active in the events of history and disposing them to His appointed ends is expressed in the words of Isa. 55.10-11: 'As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.'

The same conception of God as living and active in history, and as everywhere accomplishing His purposes through His effective word; the same thought of God unfailingly conducting the historical process from its appointed beginning to its appointed end, and doing all this through the action of His effective word is constantly both implicit and explicit in the NT writings. There is of course this difference, that the NT writers' view of Jesus was such that God's action and Christ's action were for them one and therefore the language which in the OT would be applied and addressed to Yahweh is applied and addressed to Jesus Christ.

Various aspects of this thought about God and history may be traced in the NT, and particularly in the use of the term *λόγος*.

(*a*) God's purpose cannot fail. All three Synoptic Gospels record the saying of Christ, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words (*λόγοι*) shall not pass away' (Mark 13.31, Matt. 24.35, Luke 21.33). And this claim by Jesus is the same claim as is made by Paul in the passage in Rom. 9-11 where he wrestles with the problem of history especially as it concerns the destiny of his own people Israel. *οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*—'it is not as though the word of God hath come to nought' (Rom. 9.6). It is the same certainty he is affirming in 1 Thess. 2.13: 'When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.' The same thought is present also in Heb. 2.2 and notably in Rev. 17.17 where the fulfilment of the words of God is the theme.

(*b*) God's word is faithful, *πίστος ὁ λόγος*, writes the author of 2 Tim. 2.11 and of Titus 3.8. And this faithfulness to Himself, to His covenant, to His promise is perhaps simply another way of putting the point we have just left. The thought is particularly clear in John 17.17 where Jesus, praying to the Father, says 'Thy word is truth' (*ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν*). Truth is to be understood in terms of the Hebrew root אמן and consequently it is the self-consistency of God's action in history that is being thought of here.

(*c*) There are many places in the NT in which the thought of organic growth and a continual thrust outwards is associated with the λόγος of God. This is evidenced in the parable of the sower and in a series of phrases used by the author of Acts to describe the growth of the early Christians' community, e.g. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ηὔξανεν (Acts 6.7, cf. 12.24, 19.20). All this is evidence of the power of growth inherent in the word spoken by God, and may fruitfully be compared with the gangrenous power of growth of evil words which is referred to in 2 Tim. 2.17.

(*d*) In further development of this thought of the power of organic growth inherent in the word one may note that the word of the living God is itself spoken of as 'living' and 'active' (Heb. 6.12), 'living and continuing' (1 Pet. 1.23), and so becomes the medium by which God conveys true life to men. It is perhaps not too fanciful to suggest that this thought is present in the narrative of the cleansing in the Capernaum synagogue in Luke 4. 'They were astonished at his teaching: for his word was with authority' we read in v. 32; and then in v. 36 after the account of the healing: 'Amazement came upon all, and they spake together one with another, saying, What is this word? for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out.'

Perhaps this is an appropriate point at which to pass to the next section, for these senses make it amply clear that the power and effect of the word of God is associated in a very special way with Jesus Himself, and it is in fact in the NT view of the Incarnation that we find fullest expression given to the thought of the effective word of God active in history.

2. *The Incarnation*

Let us begin an examination of the relevance of this Word-Deed conception to the NT account of the Incarnation by recalling some words of G. F. Moore: 'Nowhere either in the Bible or in the extra-canonical literature of the Jews is the word of God a personal agent or on the way to become such' (*Judaism*, I, p. 415). Two errors are involved in this statement.

In the first place the term 'personal' is unfortunately ambiguous. The apparent implication of Moore's words is that when the Christian speaks of the 'persons' of the Trinity he means (among other things) that the relation between God the Father and Jesus Christ the Word of God is the same as that which individualistic human society imagines, whether rightly or wrongly, to exist between two human individuals. One has only to state the matter in this way for it to be immediately clear that if it is this kind of view which Moore is tacitly opposing to the Jewish view then the contrast he is describing is not between Judaism and Christianity, but between Judaism and what the Christian Church has condemned as heresy. The term 'person' is not intended in this sense when it is used technically by Christian theologians in their account of the persons of the Trinity.

But this ambiguity arises because of a much deeper misunderstanding. 'The word of God', says Moore in the same context, 'is sometimes vividly personified, as in Wisdom 18.15 f. . . . But it is an error to see in such personification an approach to personalisation.' This statement is inaccurate largely because it is impossible quite to render the idiom of one language into the idiom of another language of a different genius and structure. For the form of Moore's statement about *Jewish* usage derives from *Greek* analytic thought, and although the statement may be *approximately* accurate, it is only an approximation, and the margin of error is considerable—so considerable as to make the statement itself misleading, and indeed inaccurate. It is perhaps true that what Moore calls 'personalisation' is a notion alien to Jewish thought, but if so, then what he and we understand when we speak of 'personification' is also alien to that thought. To speak in these terms at all is in fact possible only upon the assumption that ultimate reality is not one but two—the personal and the impersonal; or, to use the terms in which this antithesis commonly finds expression, the spiritual and the material. Those who press this distinction find themselves asserting an ultimate metaphysical dualism which is basically opposed both to Jewish and to orthodox Christian thought, and against which, as it has found expression in various forms of ancient and modern agnosticism, the Christian Church has considerably fought. If this be a true account of the situation, then by seeking to express in Greek analytical terms the Hebrew view of the Word of God, Moore has attempted the impossible or succeeded only in confusing the minds of his readers.

It is one of the contentions of this paper that the same thing has repeatedly happened when Christian thinkers trained in

Greek modes of thought have approached the task of setting forth intelligibly the nature of the Incarnation. This has necessarily been so since for such Greek modes of thought the Christian notion of Incarnation is *ex hypothesi* impossible. For them Jesus of Nazareth must ultimately be either man or God; He cannot be both. And consequently, in so far as one follows these modes of thought and expression, one cannot define Incarnation, and one is involved in inextricable logical difficulties when one seeks to explain what, for example, the writer of the Fourth Gospel meant when he called Jesus the λόγος. But the difficulties are not so great if it be recognised that the writer of that Gospel, though of course familiar with various ways in which the term was employed by Greek thought in its attempt to express the relations between God and the world, nevertheless is seeking to explain the extraordinary fact of Jesus not by reference to these Greek notions primarily, but by reference to the Hebrew notion of the effective word of God, which is God Himself in action, and which is powerful in proportion as this word is the word of God Himself, uttered by the Almighty, and, therefore, certain to accomplish that which He pleases. For such thought God's fiat and His effective action are one. 'My word . . . shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it.'—'God said "let there be light" and there *was* light', says the creation narrative of Genesis. God's word was an effective word. And echoing the בראשית the writer of the Fourth Gospel writes: 'In the beginning was the word . . . in him was life; and the life was the light of men.' What clearer indication could there be that the author's reference when he uses the term λόγος is not to any Greek notion but to the same effective word of the Almighty God of which the Hebrew scriptures spoke?

It may be remarked incidentally that while this description of Jesus as the effective Word of God is more than hinted at in many parts of the NT, one of the most interesting sections in which something like this appears is in the first half of Acts. That this should be so is of course not strange since whatever be the sources from which the author derived his material for this part of the book, and without at all involving oneself in acceptance of Tomey's views, one may fairly safely assert that these chapters have an early Aramaic base. Nevertheless it is interesting to notice how there seems already to be a foretaste of the Johannine usage here. Particularly interesting is Acts 13.26, 27, where Paul, after speaking of the witness to Jesus uttered by John the Baptist and before passing on in his historical narrative to the events of the Passion, is reported to have said, *ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη*, and then in the difficult and possibly corrupt twenty-seventh verse there occurs the participle *κρίναντες*, 'having judged', with as object either no word at all or else the pronoun *τοῦτον* referring back to the preceding *λόγον*.

One further point should be noted with regard to the relevance of the Hebrew conception of the 'Word-Deed' to the NT understanding of the Incarnation. If Jesus can be described quite early in the development of Christian thought as the effective word of God in the sense which we have been examining, then the so-called high Christology of Ephesians and Colossians will be more easily understandable. If Jesus could be thus described then it would be both natural and inevitable that He should be spoken of as the agent of Creation and not only of Redemption, and such descriptions will be seen not to be outside the main stream of Christian thinking, as some critics have urged, but rather to constitute one of its central emphases.

PROTESTANT THEOLOGY IN GERMANY DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

by Dr HARMANNUS OBENDIEK

We may begin our survey of Protestant theology where Karl Barth left it off in *Die Protestantische Theologie im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, which he ended with the observation that for all his popularity and following, Ritschl failed finally to carry the day. Theology moved on beyond his moral evaluation of Christ. Even those under the influence of Ritschl did not simply repeat what he had said—e.g. Wilhelm Herrmann. In May 1900 Adolf Harnack's *The Essence of Christianity* was published. Harnack's aim was to demonstrate what the various Churches and Christian communities held in common: that God is our Father and the human soul is of infinite value. As to the Gospel of Jesus Christ he declared, 'Not the Son but the Father alone has a place in the Gospel proclaimed by Jesus'.

Besides the line taken by Ritschl, Herrmann and Harnack, there was another theological trend associated with the names of Cremer, Kähler and Schlatter. Cremer was a Lutheran for whom the centre of theology was the doctrine of justification interpreted forensically. According to his view we are justified by the fact that God 'came down from heaven, clad in our flesh and blood, in order to die for us and to live with us'. Here the sense of the forgiveness of sin as an irrefutable certainty was the driving force. From that root the whole of Christology and personal faith in God's providence were made to develop, secure from all arguments of reason. Cremer stood for the independence of theology and fought against all secularisation threatening theology from the side of profane science.

Martin Kähler was a spiritual heir to Tholuck, and had his roots in the great revival. He too taught justification. He was essentially a Biblical theologian and spoke of his 'resolute Biblicism, to which the friendship with H. Cremer contributed'. He did not, however, ignore the results of historico-critical research, but went on to raise the question to what extent history itself can constitute sufficient ground for faith, for example in his book *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche Christus*. The essence of Revelation, he believed, is withheld from us. We have to do with the testimony of the Apostles and it is through that testimony that we come to believe, i.e. to experience what the Biblical witnesses proclaim. At the same time Kähler sought to point out the independent nature of the object with which Church and theology are concerned.

Schlatter was a man of profound erudition who had no other aim than the 'opening of Scripture'. For that reason he made an exhaustive study of Rabbinic literature and wrote expositions and commentaries on the New Testament. 'The removal of the impediments that lie between us and the New Testament', he wrote, 'is the primary condition for fruitful work in the Church.' It was not his wish to found a school, but rather to inspire young scholars and theologians to pay meticulous care to the written text.

These men sought to be theologians of the Bible by studying the special nature of the Biblical message. It remains to be seen how far even they were bound to the heritage of the nineteenth century and how far they failed to advance beyond or break through its presuppositions. Certainly the generation taught by these men was willing to listen to God's Word in the Scripture. A man like D. Humburg, the well-known chairman of the *Rheinische Bekenntnissynode* was influenced by Kähler, so was the great theologian of the Confessional Church, Professor J. Schniewind, while the preacher of its first Assembly had been a student of Schlatter. Thus the theology of these Biblical scholars proved of great significance in *statu confessionis*.

Erich Schäder in his book *Theozentrische Theologie* (1909-15) reproached theology for putting man into the centre, thus 'making the human a measure for God's greatness'. He tried to substantiate that protest by tracing the anthropocentric trend in dogmatics since Schleiermacher. It is interesting to note that for him even the Biblicism of Cremer and Kähler come under that judgment. He maintained that Cremer was basically 'subjectivist'—not without some justification, for Cremer used to speak of the 'religio-psychological task of dogmatic discussion'. We must not forget that Cremer fell back upon conscience and its feeling of guilt before God, so that the ultimate certainty of God's existence was made to rest on the natural conscience. Kähler as a 'theologian of the Word' would seem to be different, but according to Schäder even his theology was a 'theology of personal experience' in which the motive for faith, or at least the negative side of it, was to be found within ourselves.

The first volume of Schäder's work was thus rather critical. The second, where he expounds his own position, made it clear to what extent he regarded his 'theocentric theology' as a principle. But this principle then became a standard with which Schäder, the man with his humanly secured opinion, measured the theology of others. That is the very reason why Schäder's work has not had any lasting influence, though we must not forget his attempt, however inadequate, to break with Schleiermacher.

The same direction was taken by the Leipzig Professor of the Psychology of Religion, Karl Girgensohn (1875-1925), and others, who called for a 'pneumatic exegesis'. There was more at stake there than a question of method. They had no intention of evolving a new kind of exegesis either to replace or to supplement the historico-critical method. The question was more fundamental: what is the ultimate aim of exegesis? Allegorical interpretation had failed; would typology do? Or was psychology the solution? For a time it looked as if exegesis, formerly dominated by dogmatic considerations, would be superseded by a new exegesis, in which psychology was to supply most of the heuristic instruments, e.g. in respect of the personality of Jesus, but whatever we may think about it, the call for pneumatic exegesis was a call to remember the implications of the fact that theology is a function of the Church.

That was also the reason why after the First World War the philosophy of religion showed little sign of life, though one might well have expected the opposite. A man like Lüdemann with his two volumes of dogmatics came too late. There the Christian faith was taken to be the 'normal and reasonable reflex caused by the metaphysical situation of man, his dependence on the infinite Being by which he lives'. All interest in such speculative theology had gone. It is true, there appeared many monographs like Heinzelmann's *Die Stellung der Religionen im modernen Geistesleben*, and moreover it was a common habit to introduce dogmatics with religio-philosophical arguments. Karl Heim's survey in two volumes is significant in its division, *The Essence of Religion*, and *The Essence of Christianity*. There was, however, a marked tendency away from the general to the special. The vague term 'religion' failed to meet the need. Those who were concerned with it became more and more isolated and lost the ear of their contemporaries. Not only had a general conception of religion become dubious, but it had become impossible to treat the message of the Bible simply as a specific instance of religion.

It was Troeltsch, the versatile man interested in theology, philosophy, history, sociology, ethics and politics, who said: 'To fulfil the task of a modern philosophy of history we need men with faith and courage.' It was the work of his life to contribute to those tasks. For him the philosophy of history necessarily had to do with the philosophy of religion. Troeltsch was on the search for the deepest principle of consciousness expressing itself in the reality of religious life. So he arrived at a religious *a priori*, and was convinced that, in spite of the variety of its forms, faith in God is always the same at its heart: ideas are filled with contents which differ only according to the diversity of time and religion. It was well that W. Köhler in his book on Ernst Troeltsch (1941) should expound this thought and try to make a later generation appreciate it, but it remains to be asked: how can the attitude of Troeltsch be compatible with the absoluteness of Christianity (a notion put forward and defended so passionately since the beginning of the century)? For Troeltsch Christianity as the normative religion was no more than a subjective axiom.

One might have expected further development along these religio-philosophical lines. That was not the case, though we must not omit to mention in this connexion the work of Paul Tillich, Professor of Protestant Theology at the Technical College of Engineering (!) and then Professor of Philosophy at Frankfurt. As a philosopher concerned with the whole of civilisation Tillich showed that in all fields, in science as well as in worship and dogma, there had been a general turning away from the notion of cosmic immanence, the subtle creed of the middle classes. His principal categories were the 'unconditional' and the 'demonic'. He pointed away from the speculations and the attitude of the spectator toward a 'realism in faith' as the only adequate attitude for the time (1926), and challenged men 'to think and talk about the religious situation of our time in absolute and active responsibility'.

In 1925 W. Herrmann's posthumous book on Christian Doctrine was published. It had no room for philosophy of religion. For Herrmann the dignity of the love of Jesus was the humbling and reassuring power that created faith. There was no need for philosophy or speculation, nor for a vindication of faith; for faith, he held, was grounded on a reality that could never be anticipated. For Herrmann the supreme question was: what is faith and how is it gained? This meant doubtless a farewell to all philosophical argumentation and apologetic manoeuvres. Faith must have, and must itself be, a secure basis. Was it possible to be satisfied with Herrmann's answer when actually reading the text of the Bible?

Besides Herrmann another Marburg Professor must be mentioned, Rudolf Otto, with special reference to his book, *The Idea of the Holy*. It is not irrevelant for an assessment of Otto to recall that he published works on the philosophy of religion of Kant and Fries and that he edited a text of Indian mysticism (1917). As a constitutive element of all religion Otto extracted the *mysterium tremendum et fascinosum*. Here a feeling of distance, an awareness of the fall of creation comes to the fore, and God appears as the 'totally other'. Thus Otto would appear to be the last of his generation who still tried to examine the essence of religion, but at the same time he should be regarded as one who at least signalised a new conception in theology. According to Kierkegaard 'the Philistine's love of God begins when his vegetative life is in full operation, when his hands are joined across his stomach, and from the head leant back in a soft easy-chair, a drowsy look is raised to the ceiling'. Otto's discovery could well have dispatched that kind of Philistine piety, had his ideas not been expressed in that unobliging neuter (*Das Heilige*), i.e. if he had proclaimed the holy God and Saviour instead of treating the holy as a phenomenon. Karl Barth's critical remarks may be cited here: 'Rudolf Otto's idea of the holy, whatever else it may be, has at any rate not to be understood as the Word of God, because it is the *numinosum*, and the *numinosum* is irrational. The irrational, however, cannot be distinguished from a power of nature declared absolute. But this is the very distinction which is essential for the understanding of God's Word' (*Kirchl. Dogmatik*, 1/1, p. 140). To what extent did Rudolf Otto, in spite of all his naturalism, awaken men's minds and prepare them for the message which proclaims not the holy, but the holy God and Saviour, the message that does not explain the 'totally other' by its psychological effects as a category but speaks of God as the God of judgment and salvation?

It almost seemed as if the psychology of religion were to take the place of the philosophy of religion. Studies in the history of religion had already attacked the predominance of philosophical thought, when by the beginning of the century the psychology of religion gained eminence. In Germany it was first a question of taking up and absorbing results from work abroad rather than of indigenous observation and research. In 1925 the fourth edition of William James' *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, and other works of his, were translated. Girgensohn in his voluminous work discussed the psychic arrangement of religious experience, and the Swiss Oskar Pfister published his analysis of the ministerial office. This new scientific enterprise had a good start, particularly since, on the historico-psychological side, works like Söderblom's *The Origin of Belief in God* (1926) and Heiler's study on *Prayer* (1923, 8th edit.) had become well known. The results of studies in this field have been collected and presented by W. Trillhaas in his book *Grundzüge der Religionspsychologie* (1946).

However, the psychology of religion did not succeed in displacing or even in repressing systematic theology, for theology remained suspicious of these efforts, not so much out of a stiff purism, as out of the conviction that the human psychic disposition could not be the essential object of theology. In actual fact systematic theology flourished. After the First World War compendia were published one after the other, such as those by Ihmel (1920), Kaftan, Horst Stephen, and Schlatter (1921), followed by the works of R. Seeberg and T. Haering in 1922. Other text-books appeared in the following years, but were they to be the bread of life for Church and world? There is little doubt that they were too bound up with the cultural life of the nation to be of much service to the Church when under the Nazi régime she was put to the test, both inwardly and outwardly—indeed they were dangerous. Something new was needed in theology—and that began to emerge in the significant years 1921 and 1922, so that in the providence of God, when in 1933 the Church was forced to confess her faith, she entered the battle not unprepared.

In 1921 a new Chair for Reformed Theology was founded at Göttingen University. During the nineteenth century hundreds of congregations were lost to the Reformed Church and only one Reformed Chair remained in the Universities, that at Erlangen occupied by the brilliant scholar, E. F. Karl Müller. The founding of the Göttingen Chair was an attempt to reverse the trend, but few expected the tremendous effect to follow the first appointment in 1921. The call was extended to Karl Barth, then a minister in a rural parish in Switzerland, who had already published his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans*, a book which created a great stir and marked a new epoch.

Besides Barth there were others proclaiming a new message, although their views were governed by different motives. In 1921 Gogarten published his book, *The Religious Decision*, in which he pled for an understanding of the *I-Thou* relation as the relation in which God's Word is heard, in which man learns God's decision about him, and in which he is summoned to obedience. In 1922 G. Merz edited Zündel's book, *Jesus*, in which the modernised picture of Jesus was rejected and the message of the Kingdom of God was proclaimed again. A dominant influence here was Blumhardt. Who would have expected that in the heyday of religious liberalism? Blumhardt's biography by Zündel saw several editions and helped to minister to real spiritual hunger. Another significant work was that of Werner Elert, *The Battle for Christianity*, a history of the relation between Protestant Christianity in Germany and its environment since Schleiermacher and Hegel. Elert unveiled the dangers of a synthesis in which Christianity and non-Christianity are amalgamated, and called for a *distasis*, for a feeling of distance over against the environment, and urged the independence of theology as a branch of science. Doubtless his idea of a rhythmic change of synthesis and diastasis, regulated by some law of tension, is misleading, but his criticism of the disastrous secularisation of German Protestantism in the nineteenth century did good service and was to have wide effects.

This criticism, which did not cease from now on, expressed itself first in W. Lütgert's book, *The Religion of German Idealism and its End*. In it the Church was challenged to consider whether or not to adhere to the German idealistic conception of Christianity. One unmistakable answer, 'fall back on the Reformation', was given by a new edition of Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, to which Gogarten added a programmatic epilogue. He rejected the attempt of Troeltsch 'to maintain at all costs the peace that had been made between Protestantism and the spirit of the modern world, but which was already renounced on the part of the latter'. The problem, however, was too deep and urgent to be solved by a mere revival of the Reformers. The 'Luther Renaissance' of 1917 was not deep enough and in its consequences it was even dangerous, as it appeared later. Gogarten made much of the word 'reality'—'to be bound by reality can mean nothing else than to be bound by God.' However, the mortgage on Gogarten's conception was evident. And yet he saw clearly that the modern concept of personality was not to be found in the Reformers, and that the doctrine of the enslaved will was still the crucial issue as it had been in the debate between Luther and Erasmus.

The involvement of theology and philosophy was made the main point of Gogarten's polemic against Barth, though that cannot be taken as genuine criticism. In his *Gericht oder Skepsis* he accused Barth of philosophical speculation of the relation between the perishable and the imperishable, of a paradoxical identity which Barth was said to call 'God'. Gogarten then formulated his divergence from Barth by representing Barth's 'identity theology' as essentially 'aesthetic' and timeless, and claiming that his own was essentially 'ethical' in its concern for man in his historical actuality—but in point of fact Gogarten's whole discussion took the question out of the field of theology altogether by applying categories that were not really appropriate to theology.

The time had come for a completely new orientation. That had to begin necessarily with criticism. Pietism, Schleiermacher, the theology of the revival, of inner experience, idealism, psychology of religion, synthesis—all were called in question. That process was greatly inspired by Sören Kierkegaard. His works were translated and many studies were published interpreting his thought and bringing his influence to bear on Church and Theology (cf. the writings of Brunner, Hirsch, Bohlin, Diem, etc.). That was the end of spectator-theology.

That the whole of theology was to be refashioned and conceived very differently, as compared with that of the previous two centuries, became apparent in the fact that the variety of theological trends ceased. That process had already begun with the twentieth century. On the one hand, 'positive' theology had become 'modern and positive', after Reinhold Seeberg had called for a new way in which to preach old truth. On the other hand, the methods of historico-critical research were recognised by all and no longer regarded as characteristic of the so-called liberals. Consequently theologians came to co-operate with each other, although their ideas were by no means similar. Paul Althaus, Karl Heim and Karl Barth, for example, were editors of *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus*, although later on the theological thinking of these three had to go along different lines. A similar event befell the periodical *Zwischen den Zeiten*, edited by Karl Barth, Emil Brunner and Friedrich Gogarten, when in 1934 Barth felt compelled to issue a decisive *No* against Brunner's thesis that 'it is the task of our generation to find the way back to the right *theologia naturalis*'.

Theology had entered a new field, but the struggle went on, although it took a different form with the publication of Rudolf Bultmann's book, *Jesus*, which appeared in a series bearing the heading *The Immortals*! There historico-critical analysis was taken so radically and carried so far, that only after 'prevailing likelihood' was Jesus adjudged the bearer of the thoughts which we find in the oldest layer of the Synoptic tradition. What remained then, after critical analysis, was a 'real encounter with the object', in the existential sense of a call heard, a divine demand received and then obeyed. The existential took precedence over the historical, but the strict proclamation of the existential attitude could not suffice theology, so that the question put by the nineteenth century was left unanswered.

It is true that faith cannot be grounded on the historical, and that fundamentalism is retreat rather than victory, but history cannot be irrelevant for faith in Jesus Christ, as it is in the thought of Bultmann who can even put quotation marks around the name 'Jesus' to indicate its symbolic reference.

Emanuel Hirsch was of some importance for the period in question. He learned from Karl Holl, whose studies in Luther, though somewhat prejudiced, had helped many by opening up once again the way to an understanding of the great Reformer. Hirsch turned to Fichte's philosophy of religion and in 1926 wrote *Idealistic Philosophy and Christianity*. He refused to entertain the incompatibility of idealism and Christianity, adopting a position which later (after 1933) compelled him (out of conviction, and not because it was personally advantageous) to champion the Church policy adopted by the notorious group of 'national Christians'.

Although the new movement in theology had not yet assumed a distinct pattern, it became apparent that there could be no way forward through the heritage of the Renaissance, in the spirit of enlightenment and rationalism or in the spirit of romanticism and idealism. Over against these tendencies attempts were made by way of mysticism and apologetics to maintain the autonomy of Church and theology.

Heiler emphasised the importance of mysticism (1919) and Carl Clemen and Rudolf Otto followed, and literature on faith and mysticism flourished. Men sought to find in mysticism the very essence of all religion, and so to gain an unassailable position against the advance of historico-critical analysis and of secular civilisation. In face of coming tribulation, others, notably Hunzinger and Carl Stange, turned to apologetics in order to save Church, theology and Christianity. Karl Heim at Tübingen was also concerned with apologetics, but not in the same banal way. His method was rather to employ philosophical arguments to clear away misunderatanding, and open the door for faith. There can be no doubt that Heim offered real help to the intellectual conscience, although at the same time his thought drove more deeply into the questions of guilt and destiny, and certainty. Heim who is still at work in Tübingen is profoundly aware of what his contemporaries think, and is concerned to speak to them in a way they can understand and by apologetics to clear away the elements in their thought that make the reality of religious experience appear unthinkable. Must not his enterprise be charged with the same accusation that is to be laid at the door of all apologetics which fails to follow the proper task of theology, reflection on the testimony and message of the Bible?

Karl Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* has already been mentioned as marking the great turning-point in theology. It was his *Church Dogmatics* which worked out consistently and systematically the new development, and demonstrated the theologically legitimate procedure, systematic exposition following upon exegesis. The change in title from *Christian Dogmatics* in the first edition to *Church Dogmatics* in the second was itself indicative of the trend. The nineteenth century under the shadow of Hegel, Kant, and Schleiermacher had been the century of *Christendom*, but its theology was too individualistic and lacked responsibility. With Karl Barth the setting for doctrine became the Church, and the effect of that change was enormous both among ministers and laymen—though we must not forget the writings of Professor Haitjema and Wilhelm Kolfhaus who contributed effectively to the new movement, while Haitjema himself mentions as a forerunner of Barth the name of Kohlbrügge, that lonely theologian of the late nineteenth century who resumed the cause of the Reformation, fought against the spirit of the enlightenment and idealism, rejected free-will, and taught predestination and justification, all under the *sola gratia*.

When Barth began his exposition with a chapter on the Word of God the indispensable presupposition of all theology was put on the agenda. There was an air of 'either/or' about the whole work, but it was not the arrogant 'either/or' of an individual, as events in Germany in 1933 soon made clear, for then it became evident to all that theology within the responsibility of the Church is no mere speculation but the servant of the Gospel and also of the decisions of the Church on matters of Faith and Order. And so the six theses of the 'Theological Declaration of Barmen' (made on the first assembly of the Confessing Church in 1934) became the epitome of what had happened in theology. Of extreme importance was the first thesis which expressed the principle of the new theological movement, the thesis which called in question the right of natural theology, whether in the sense of Emil Brunner's *theologia naturalis* or Paul Althaus's *original revelation.* No doubt it is tempting to interpret the *Barmen Declaration* in a pragmatic light, and it is historical fact that the Declaration provided a sort of constitution for the Confessing Church in Germany, subscribed to by Lutheran, Reformed and United Churchmen. Much of that unity has since fallen away and it is not surprising that in the West today where Christianity is 'secure', men like Althaus should make war upon the 'Christomonism' of Barmen. In *statu confessionis*, however, it was just this Christomonism so-called which offered resolute opposition to the nationalising and naturalising of theology. In the preface to the volume in which he has collected and edited the decisions taken by the twelve 'confessing' assemblies of the United Protestant Church in former Prussia, Wilhelm Niesel remarks: 'They have importance not only because they are objects of Church History, but rather because they contain fundamentally new notions for theology and Church law.' The same must be said of the theses of Barmen. We believe that the theological discussions of the fourth and fifth centuries, the fruit of which appeared in the great Church Councils, were engaged with issues which were a matter of life and death for the Church. So we think of the decisions over the questions of God in nature and history in our own times, not as mere pragmatic manoeuvres but as involving issues of life and death for the Church.

The question at stake here can be illustrated by a debate between Paul Althaus and Wilhelm Stapel. In 1932 Stapel published a book bearing the title *The Christian Statesman, a Theology of Nationalism,* in which he contended that every society has its own law of morality and every nation its own *nomos.* The state, he held, had four fundamental rights: war, capital punishment, loyalty, and amnesty. Christianity on the other hand is the sphere not of the moral law, but of the resurrection. The Christian statesman, however, must make use of the four rights of the state. When Stapel went on to show that nations have endowments like individuals and are to be rated accordingly, he could not but ascribe the top of the scale to the German nation with its *nomos,* morality and endowments: a theology *ad maiorem gloriam populi Germani*! Althaus disagreed with Stapel, rejecting the plurality of rights or *nomoi* and pointing instead to the *nomos* of Scripture. Here we must give Althaus his due, but when he published *Die deutsche Stunde der Kirche* (1934) summoning the Church to proclaim not only the Gospel but also 'law and orders', his words were rather revealing: 'In these days we see the miracle of rebirth, healing, recovery and new life, a breaking of the chains. In experiencing this should we not be like those that dream of that one great rebirth? An eschatology, not falsely concerned with the other world, but realistic, is not ashamed to be related to the great event of these days'! That even Althaus could write in these terms, shows that the Declaration of Barmen was no mere theological speculation but a decision of the most existential kind concerned with the very life of the Church.

The same issue was raised by the two volumes of Althaus' *The Christian Truth*, and of Elert's *The Christian Faith.* Although the predominant theme is Revelation, the old nineteenth century ideas of history come to life again in these works. When he insists on looking behind the Christ of the Kerygma and the Gospels in order to be sure of His historicity, the thought of Althaus is interwoven with his idea of 'original revelation' which is really an interpretation of existence, of the Spirit, of history and nature in the sense of speculative idealism. Even Goethe becomes an authority here with his conception of nature as meaningful and purposive, and as an image of the supra-human spirit, God. Nature in fact is taken to be God's self-manifestation. The issue is clear: Are we to have a theology of God's Word or speculation from some point outside the Bible? Elert began with an analysis of Being with the idea of destiny uppermost in the discussion. He pled for a conception of Christian doctrine as critical and normative rather than descriptive. If only Elert had worked this out consistently instead of tailing off in the same direction as Althaus, but instead he directed a polemic against Barth, the very theologian who has consistently followed up the problem set forth by Elert!

Another line that is still being pursued in Germany is the examination of the creeds and confessions of the Church in order to find new foundations, after the Kerygma had been dissolved by the philosophy of Enlightenment and Idealism. A notable example of this work is the volume of Professor

Edmund Schlink on the *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*. But here we are faced right away with the question of the authority of these documents. They themselves claim authority only as interpretations of Holy Scripture; but we have to ask how far these confessions are influenced by contemporary philosophy. That, for example, is the problem of a book by Link published in 1940, called *Luther's Struggle for the Freedom of Theology from Philosophy*. This is a question that must be faced if we are to have a theology of the Word which is open to criticism, for it would be disastrous if we are to become fundamentalists in regard to the Confessions, as well as to the Scriptures, holding these documents as deposits of authoritative truth.

Still another line has been taken by Professor Helmut Thielicke of Tübingen whose main theme is 'Church and world'. He is concerned about the proper way in which to proclaim the Gospel and God's commandments to modern man who must be recognised and addressed in his inner helplessness and temptation. Several works wrestling with these questions have appeared since the War, the latest of which is the first volume of a *Theological Ethic*—all of them, Thielicke declares, are to be understood in terms of a *Theologie der Anfechtung* in the sense of Luther's continuous *tentationes*. Here we have in a measure a return to Scripture and a notion of theology as *theologia viatorum*. Thielicke is surely right in his claim that theology must be clarified and reinterpreted for our own day, but he himself is tempted throughout to adopt a psychological rather than a Biblical view of man.

Here we touch upon a complex question which more than any other is agitating the German Church today, the problem of *Entmythologisierung* or *demythologising*, as it may be interpreted. Discussion on this question began in earnest in 1941 with two articles from the pen of Rudolf Bultmann, *Natural Revelation* and *New Testament and Mythology*. In the first of these Bultmann pointed with great emphasis to the fact that nature just fails to reveal what is essential about God, and that every phenomenon in history is ambiguous. 'The true purpose of revelation in nature and history', he wrote, 'is to point to the revelation of the forgiving grace of God in Christ. Only in doing that can it be revelation to us; but that really means that there is no revelation besides Christ.' This bears interesting comparison with what Althaus had written on nature and history, but it is primarily the other aspect of Bultmann's views that has roused such keen controversy, the call to demythologise the Gospel.

This was not of course a new question, for it had been raised earlier by liberal scholars, only to be answered by excising the so-called 'mythical' passages from the text of Scripture. Bultmann, however, raised the issue at a deeper level, not in connexion with individual passages but with the whole 'imaginary world' of the New Testament. Now that our picture of the world has been radically altered by modern science, he held, we must learn to distinguish the core of the Gospel from its mythological setting in the New Testament. Among those who entered the lists against Bultmann, the most significant perhaps was Professor Schniewind of Halle (who died in 1948). In the debate which ensued, outstanding for the absence of any *rabies theologorum*, Schniewind published seven theses which were answered by Bultmann.

Schniewind began by acknowledging that Bultmann was not concerned with criticism in itself but with criticism as an instrument in the proclamation of the Gospel as a means of clearing away for modern man those elements in the New Testament which he with his modern scientific outlook inevitably regarded as 'mythical', in order that unhampered by these difficulties he might be free to make a decision in the face of the genuine *scandalon*. Behind all this, however, the real issue, Schniewind insisted, is whether we are able to hear the *Kerygma* of the New Testament or not. 'Without doubt the *Kerygma* carries in itself the power to awaken in us true understanding of it.' While that is the basic issue, the main point around which the debate was carried on, was the notion of eschatology and the eschatological character of the New Testament message. Schniewind maintained that in Bultmann's conception the eschatological character of the event of Christ is mistaken for timelessness which really involves a denial of its historical nature. How can any such flight from the historical as something past be justified? Even if we approve of Bultmann's initiative in tackling the problem of demythologisation, we can never escape the necessity of speaking of 'heavenly' realities in earthly terms. Nor must we fail to examine our own time-conditioned conceptions and our own imagination in relation to those of the New Testament. It would be false to declare our modern picture of the world, our cosmic conception, absolute, and then use it as a critical norm for the interpretation of the New Testament. In contrast to Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament* one should also mention the work on the same subject by Ethelbert Stauffer published by ecumenical initiative at Geneva in 1948, a book which has met with various receptions governed by one's attitude to the issue formulated by Stauffer: *Entmythologisierung oder Realtheologie.*

That is the general picture of the theological situation in Germany today, but the detailed problems, apart from specific studies in Old Testament and New Testament and Church History, are of supreme importance. They may well be divided up and grouped round the six theses of the Barmen Declaration:

(1) The first concerns the source of the Church's message. It is the issue of Revelation and natural theology and the demand for a theological anthropology.

(2) The second calls for a fresh study of the relation between the Law and Gospel or rather the Gospel and the Law, and involves historical study of the confessions and the dogmatic foundations of the Churches.

(3) This thesis concerns the Church, and is all the more urgent because most of the *State Churches* and *The Evangelical Church in Germany* have rewritten their constitutions. The negotiations which led to the establishment of the *Evangelical Church in Germany* showed clearly that Church order depends on doctrine, and doctrine in turn upon the interpretation of the confessions. There are some, for example, who regard the *Evangelical Church in Germany* only as a federation of Churches, whereas others regard it as one Church, a divergence in view which corresponds roughly to the present attitude towards the Barmen Declaration. How is Barmen to be understood as a bond between different denominations, or does it carry with its confession the idea of one Church?

In this connexion there has been taking place a rethinking of the sacraments, while the whole field of liturgy is being treated anew. Clearly, it will not help to exalt the sacraments above the sermon in order to heal the weaknesses of preaching; nor will it help to return to the formulations of the sixteenth century without fresh appeal to Holy Scripture, otherwise the unity of Reformed and Lutherans at the Lord's Table may easily be lost.

One trifling incident has its own importance. The *German Evangelical Church* has become the *Evangelical Church in Germany*. That is another result of the Church struggle. In those days the battle was joined against a 'Christendom' which claimed to bring the Biblical message *and* human programmes like national causes into a synthesis, but at Barmen the 'and' was crossed out, and 'alone' was written large: Christ, Grace, Holy Scripture *alone*.

The word *alone* compels us to rethink our relation to the Roman Catholic Church. The *Una Sancta* is accepted by many Evangelical or Protestant ministers as a basis for co-operation, if not as an ultimate goal. That co-operation began during the Church struggle in Germany, when the common enemy encouraged a united battle-front between Protestants and Catholics, which later developed into a fellowship with friendly and theological purposes. Roman Catholic Church History ceased to look at the Reformation with the eyes of Denifle or Grisar. Typical of that change is the work of the Roman Catholic Lortz who in his book *Die Reformation in Deutschland* (1940) could write with relative impartiality, 'Luther discovered anew the core of Roman Catholicism, but heretically'. We must take care that the autonomy of the Church gained during persecution is given a doctrinal formulation within the domain of Christology, while particular attention must be paid to the reasons why, and the way in which, the unity of the Church is actually confessed in the Creed. No doubt eschatology will have a say in this, but the Roman doctrine of *Christus prolongatus* may serve to challenge the Protestant Church and its theology to consider whether their eschatology is anything more than a final chapter on the Last Things.

(4) The fourth thesis concerns a matter that is internal to the Church, *ministry and congregation*, but that in turn leads out beyond the bounds of a particular Church to the whole relation between the Church and the world.

(5) The fifth thesis throws light upon a number of important issues, all connected with the doctrine of the two Kingdoms (Luther), issues concerning the State, political ethic, and law.

(6) The last of the theses reminds us of the true task of the

Church, and of the Church's continual temptation to betray that task. That is a temptation that cannot be overcome by a movement under the slogan 'Scripture and Creed' which has become very popular with us. It is certainly helpful to be made acquainted again with the Confessions of the Church (new editions of Lutheran Confessions were issued in 1930, and of Reformed Confessions and Church Orders in 1938), and with the messages of the Reformers through new editions of the works of Luther and Calvin, but we must beware of the dangers of neo-orthodoxy. It will not do simply to open the Scriptures and expect an immediate solution of all our problems. True exegesis will always remind us of 'the riddle of the New Testament', and will warn us against the short-circuit of mere Biblicism.

Let us conclude with a reference to Calvin. If the beginning of his *Institutes* is to be understood as an attempt at a *theologia naturalis*, by the fifth chapter it is quite clear that he has cast that aside: no man can attain true knowledge of God by nature. And so in the sixth chapter he is concerned to point out that Scripture alone can show to us the true God (*verum deum ostendit*). That is the concern of Church and theology, not an experienced or invented God, but the God revealed in Holy Scripture. Theology can be nothing else than an attempt to understand and interpret Scripture. That is the great notion alive in German theology today. All theology can do is to serve the *Kerygma*. To be a theologian means to be a teacher of Scripture, and that means first of all to be a student of Scripture.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION[1]

by THE LATE PROFESSOR JULIUS SCHNIEWIND

THIS is a very serious subject. Perhaps we are afraid to speak about it because of the controversies that once raged between pietism and the orthodoxy of Protestant scholasticism, controversies that have not yet been settled. Let us not forget, however, that even scholasticism spoke of conversion. There is a hymn by Paul Gerhard which runs:

> Lord, Thou wilt come,
> And graciously wilt bring
> Thy saints who turn to Thee,
> Yonder where Angels ever sing.

The need for conversion is never forgotten. The only difference between orthodoxy and pietism in this respect concerns the manner in which this need can be met. The claim that is made upon us radically alters our whole life: conversion means a complete reversal. We know from personal experience as well as from the experience of others the feeling of apprehension when someone tries to 'convert' us. We may want to avoid a certain house or a particular group of people because we feel: 'They want to convert me.' Perhaps that feeling is caused by misunderstanding, for turning to God is *joy*—that is a fact that is often overlooked when we speak of conversion. But the challenge remains: *Be converted.*

However, there are really serious experiences of conversion which are entirely different from one another in character. Some people have turned away from crude sins and errors. Others have experienced a conversion without any outward change. In other cases the experience of conversion can be dated down to day and hour, while in others again it takes place during certain epochs in life, perhaps within a year. Whatever form the change may take, certain questions will always be asked. Has it lasted? Was it genuine? Did it go deep enough? Has the purse been affected? Has the craving for power and influence changed? What about self-righteousness? Was conversion really a turning to God? Was it really joy? 'There is joy,' said Jesus, 'over every sinner that repenteth.' That brings us to our subject, the teaching of Scripture about conversion. We shall see as soon as we mention the subject that questions arise that are addressed to us personally and that we cannot properly understand the word of Scripture without applying it right away to our own life.

---

[1] Translated by the Rev. Dr Bernhard Citron.

Conversion is turning back to God. The Old Testament, especially the prophets, and particularly Jeremiah and Ezekiel, constantly speak of conversion to God. 'Return to God from the strange gods.' The worship of the true God is confounded with the worship of strange gods, and the images of strange gods are painted over the image of God. The Israelites came out of the desert into a cultivated land, and those who dwelt there used to say: Baal rules here. He gives us bread and wine. Is not the God of Sinai too austere? Shall we not say that the gifts which we have received from nature are also from God? Shall we not serve both the God of Israel and Baal?

In a lecture delivered a few years ago in Halle Professor von Rad pointed out how appallingly clear the parallels are between what happened in Israel then and what happens to us today. What the Old Testament has to say about returning to God is valid for us also. Luther's comment on the First Commandment in the *Larger Catechism* is widely known. The word 'God', he said, is connected with the word 'good'. Your highest good is certainly your God. For some it is Mammon, which is the most popular and the most generally worshipped idol. For others honour and reputation are the things to which they are most attached. Our own Self is to all of us the supreme idol which money, honour, or whatever else it may be, must serve. Commenting on the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans where Paul describes all the horrors and vices of paganism, Luther wrote: 'If anyone succumbs to such passions, it is a sign that he has deserted God and worships an idol. All vices and iniquities are only a sign of the turning away from the living God and true God. Because we have left God, we are thrust into evil. All evil is only a symptom; the real disease lies in the fact that we have another god. This other god is called *I*.' According to Luther we are 'bent back on our Self', pulled back with all that we do. Is this not too harsh a judgment? But Luther's judgment is derived from the story of the Fall, where we are unmasked in our actual existence. Luther proved it from his own experience that reversion to our own Self is very apparent even in our piety. We want to be like God Himself. We want to be as holy as God Himself. That was in fact the object of all Luther's striving before he experienced conversion. He wanted to love God, as He should be loved, for His own sake, without fear of punishment and without hope of reward. But the more he tried, the less he could get away from that reversion to his own Self. He watched himself by day and night. In all his piety he thought only of himself. Can any man convert himself from his own Self to God? Can we ever lose our Self? Can we ever release ourselves from our Self?

All the prophets say that God Himself converts us and that God Himself is the cause of our return. In Jeremiah 31.18 it is said: 'Turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God.' This passage could also be translated: 'Bring me home, then shall I go home.' But all the utterances of the prophets have the same meaning; it is God who turns us to Him, and man, who has turned away from God, is turned back by God Himself. 'Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved: for thou art my praise' (Jer. 17.14).

Thus it goes on throughout the whole of the Old Testament. We are told again and again, how the people, God's own nation, turn away from Him, but He always turns them back. The history of the Old Testament is the story of man's unfaithfulness and God's faithfulness. Can it end in anything but in condemnation? But in the words of Jeremiah 31 or Ezekiel 36, and in many similar passages, the end is described as a *new age*, when God's new order rules over us, because the law of God is written in our hearts. Everyone, even the least of us, will know God, because sin stands no longer between God and man when lasting forgiveness comes. A new Self will be created, God will take away the heart of stone and give us a heart of flesh, a living heart, when the Holy Spirit is shed abroad and sin is remembered no more.

This text provides a link with the New Testament. John the

Baptist speaks about conversion. The word 'repent' really means 'be converted'. We sometimes translate it by 'change your mind'. Certainly this translation is founded on a literal interpretation of the Greek word, but it is questionable if in New Testament times the meaning of the word was understood so literally. At any rate, John the Baptist and Jesus Himself spoke Aramaic. In that language the word which we translate with 'repent' must have been the same which in the Old Testament Luther always translated 'convert'. Much more is at stake than just a change of mind. Certainly to get a new heart is implied too, but our actions also are involved even to the smallest and the least; and above all our relationship to God is at stake and not merely a change of our Self. It is very important to remember that repentance is the same as conversion, and nothing less than that. It was a fundamental discovery for Luther that 'repent ye' really means 'be converted'.

How is it possible to turn to God if our plight is really so desperate as the Old Testament tells us? John expressly takes up the message of the Old Testament. This is the meaning of the Baptism which he proclaims. Baptism signifies dying. The Baptism of John already indicates that our old existence, our old man is guilty of eternal death and will be put to death, drowned as in a flood. Paul says (Rom. 6.4) to be 'baptised' is to be 'buried'. The Baptism of John must have had that meaning already: Baptism means death. Only so can we understand Jesus' application of the word 'Baptism' to His own death. 'I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished' (Luke 12.50). His hearers must therefore have understood: Baptism means death. 'Can ye be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with?' He asks the sons of Zebedee (Mark 10.38). Then His hearers must have understood: to be baptised implies to die.

If John the Baptist understood his baptism in this way, it is only because he baptised unto Him who was to come. He will accomplish the remission of sins (Mark 1.4). He will baptise with the Holy Ghost, i.e. He will fulfil the promise of the Old Testament (Jer. 31, and Ezek. 36), He will create anew all who approach God just as they are for the remission of sins. Because this unconditional promise is the basis of John's message and Baptism, he cries: 'Be converted, return.' 'Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.' (Matt 3.2). Everything depends on this word 'for'. Because God has turned to us, because He has begun His reign, therefore we can turn to Him. God has begun His reign. Satan, sin, and death have no more power over us. Therefore, *turn to God.*

Jesus takes the message of the Baptist literally. 'Turn to God for He has turned to you' (Matt. 4.17). The difference between Jesus and John the Baptist is this: Jesus fulfils what John urgently expects. Jesus is 'he that cometh', who brings remission of sins and the Holy Ghost. His words are concerned with conversion more perhaps than we realise. 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: return ye, and believe the good news' (Mark 1.14 ff). 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that returneth' (Luke 15.10). Also in His message to the whole of Israel the Lord speaks of return. 'Except ye return ye (i.e. the whole nation) shall all likewise perish' like those upon whom the tower in Siloam fell (Luke 13.1 ff).

Conversion in the preaching of our Lord has also the meaning of 'new Life'. Let us take three sayings in Mark 8.34-37.

(1) 'Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself' (verse 34). We usually understand this to mean self-discipline or renunciation. From the denial of Peter we can gather what it really stands for. He said of Jesus: 'I do not know the man.' To deny one's Self is to say of oneself: 'I do not know the man.' It means to hate one's own life and it means to let not the left hand know what the right hand does, that is to say, not to know one's own Self and one's own works (Matt. 6.3).

'Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross.' By 'cross' we usually understand suffering in general. The proper meaning of 'cross' is the death of a criminal. This becomes very clear to us, if we go back to the lifetime of Jesus before the disciples had seen His cross. In the townships of Judaea they could always see those sentenced to death being forced to carry their own gallows, that is to say, their cross. The Jews themselves used the word 'cross' in this sense. Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and laid it upon his son, as upon one 'who carries his cross'.

(2) 'Whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall

save it' (verse 35). This saying is recorded six times. It had therefore very special significance for the early Christians. It was a text for martyrs. If it meant for the martyr that in losing his life for Jesus' sake, he would find it and preserve it—then it is taken for granted that true life is eternal life. But whosoever seeks his life in this world, will try to save it at any cost. Our text has therefore a further application apart from martyrdom. The question is asked, where we seek our real life. The answer is recorded twice in general terms: 'He that loveth his life shall lose it: and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal' (John 12.25 cp. Luke 17.33). Where is our real life? Is it 'in this world' or in 'eternal life'? What man could really hate his life in this world and wholly renounce it?

(3) 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own life? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?' (verses 36 and 37). We know the text in the form: 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' But the saying in its original form is more solemn still. It does not only indicate that our soul shall suffer, but that we shall perish, body and soul. The word *psyche* in the original means both soul and life, and this double meaning is in agreement with the whole conception of the Bible. Luke has brought the expression close to general usage: 'What advantage does a man have, if he gain the whole world and lose or forfeit his own self?'

Suppose a conqueror has gained the whole world, and then dies. How can he who lost his life, regain it? The possession of the whole world is not sufficient for that. By putting the question before His hearers Jesus suggests that they are all in the same position as the world-conqueror. Who would not wish to possess every imaginable thing, yes, if it were possible, the whole world? But if we lose our life thereby, what advantage have we from all these possessions? Wherewith can we redeem our life when it is lost? 'What shall a man give in exchange for his life?'

Jesus Himself gives His own life as substitute for our lost life. He says: 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mark 10.45). He gives His life in exchange for the lost life of others. These are the 'many' (cp. Isaiah 53.11-12). He passed through god-forsakenness that He might lead us to God.

Luther called this 'the joyful exchange'. Christ takes from us what is ours and gives us what is His. His entering into our place is our very being. His holy life takes the place of our life, that was lost. What He is to us as the crucified One, that He remains, every day and hour, as the risen One. Therefore it holds good: Conversion is joy.

'There is joy in heaven over a single sinner who returns' (Luke 15.7, 10). Jesus holds a joyous banquet with the sinners who have turned to Him (Mark 2.15 ff). Joy is the mark of His whole life and work. He says: 'Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?' (Mark 2.19 ff). With Him comes the bridal season, for the time of mourning is past. Mourning and fasting were the marks of the Pharisees and also of the disciples of John (Mark 2.18). But with Jesus there is perpetual joy. Yes, even fasting, if it must still be kept, becomes a joyous occasion (Matt. 6.16-18). Sometimes fasting needs to be practised. It is the sign of renunciation and of repentance. But 'anoint thine head and wash thy face' as you do before a feast (Matt. 6.17). It is joy that we are allowed to return to God.

Are there not other sayings of Jesus in which He speaks about 'repentance in sackcloth and ashes'? From the cities in which His mighty works were done but which did not return (Matt. 11.21). He looks for penitence 'in sackcloth and ashes'. It was only right that Peter wept; his sore grief was not out of place. Jesus expects repentance from the cities, because they have seen His works of love, and Peter weeps because he remembered the words of Jesus who had both warned and pitied him at the same time.

But since life and death are at stake, His last warning contains a threat. Jesus' words in the Sermon on the Mount are a warning against everlasting separation from God, against judgment and hell. Eye and hand are ready to commit offences, and therefore 'offend' us. But thou shalt pluck them out and cut them off. How is this possible? It means nothing less than that we must get rid of our selves. It also means that we must get a new heart, for Jesus knows what is in our hearts (Mark 7.21 f): covetousness, blasphemy, pride, and foolishness. Of the latter the Psalmist speaks: 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.'

Luther emphasised that the proper return to God starts here when we deal with this our real sin. He testified that he and other like-minded monks achieved such a measure of self-discipline that they could avoid evil words and deeds, and even wicked thoughts, but the real sin lay in the heart. Therefore this is 'not a beggarly piecemeal repentance, like that of those who repent only of sins committed, for true repentance does not question what is sin and what is not sin, but throws all into one and says that everything in us is sin'. For this very reason, says Luther, atonement is also certain, since it is wrought by the substitution for us of Christ as the lamb of God who bears the sins of the world. Through faith we are given a new heart. The Word of God is addressed to our hearts and our heart is 'purified' by faith (Acts 15.9). 'To believe' means to take the Word of God to heart (Rom. 10.9 f). We are clean through the word which Jesus has spoken to us (John 15.3).

Pious people reject Jesus' call to repentance. They exclude themselves from the joy of God. Jesus proves this from the example of the elder brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son: the father invites the pious son to share his joy, that is, God's joy, over the return of the Prodigal. Why can the pious man not rejoice? Because he does not realise his own lost condition, his own envy and pride. Some have called the third parable in Luke 15 'the parable of the prodigal sons'—and that rightly too. The question is: will the pious one return?

The Exalted Christ is the same as the Incarnate Christ. He also converts the pious people. He converts Peter who had fallen because he trusted in his own faithfulness and in his own piety. He converts Paul whom zeal for God impelled to kill the disciples of Jesus. They are the pious ones who become sinners before the presence of Jesus.

Because God has exalted Jesus to be the Saviour, He still offers repentance to Israel (Acts 5.31). To the Gentiles He has granted repentance unto life by faith in the Exalted One (Acts 11.18). The conversion of the Gentiles can be described in a single phrase that sounds like a primitive Christian creed: 'Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come' (1 Thess. 1.9 f.). The work of Jesus is described in the single word 'Deliverer'. He has delivered us from the wrath to come though He Himself is Judge of the world. But He bears the human name Jesus, and this name contains a whole history, with the story of the passion in it. This is the history Paul told to the Gentiles when he showed them that this Jesus whom God had raised from the dead was the living and everpresent God.

Is renewed repentance or a second conversion possible? The letters to the Churches in the Book of Revelation mention it in words of entreating and pursuing love. Once more repentance is offered to those who are going and have gone astray. Will it not come too late? (Rev. 2.16, 21). Not even in the letters to Sardis and Laodicaea is this entreating note silenced.

Nevertheless it might come too late. The Epistle to the Hebrews shows this in words which remain unforgettable (12.17, 6.6). These words probably go back to Jesus' saying about the unpardonable sin. But the last judgment is not yet pronounced over those who are afraid of the judgment of this saying. Only one thing matters, repentance, which arises from a godly sorrow (2 Cor. 7.9 ff), and does not depend on the evil consequences of sin, but is concerned with God, and with Him alone. Such sorrow 'worketh repentance into salvation not to be repented of'.

We have seen what the Bible has to say of conversion. But we have also realised that the Biblical message cannot be given in a detached way. The Word of God addressed to us questions us in every syllable. All Christian preaching is preaching of conversion, and its proclamation is always: 'Return to God, for God has turned to you.' Right preaching is therefore preaching of conversion, even though the expression 'conversion' be used only sparingly. Where man's faith and repentance and God's turning to him are mentioned, where people are instructed in the faith, where the awakening from death-like sleep is the preacher's main concern (for this is 'revival'), where our life and death, our very existence, our renewal of new birth are in question, where forgiveness of sins, salvation, the peace of God and His grace are properly taught, there conversion is being preached.

It is a question of our new existence, of life under God's judgment, a question of life and death. It is a question of our decision for or against God.

Are we still free to decide for or against God? Can we who are doomed to eternal death, choose eternal life? We are free to choose evil and in passing sentence, the Lord says: 'Ye would not' (Matt. 23.37). We are not free to decide for God, but God has decided for us and He opens our ears that we may hear His word by which His decision is declared to us. He opens our eyes for Jesus Christ's sake, that we may see Him. Is it an incomprehensible contradiction that we are free to do evil, but not free to do good? The same contradiction applies to the heathen, but in the opposite way. Whenever we do any good, the heathen in us boasts: *hoc ego feci*—I have done it. But whenever we do anything mean or evil, we try to excuse ourselves with our bad fortune, our fate and our hereditary disposition. Is God not right? No one can assert himself before the Lord. He is crucified by the righteous, but He calls sinners to repentance, and they follow Him (Luke 5.32). The disciples who follow Him are like the righteous, always in danger of turning from Him in their pride. These stories of Jesus' earthly ministry were recorded in the Church of the Exalted Christ, and the members understood the warning, that what had happened to the righteous Jews might happen to His disciples too.

This then is conversion: to accept the death-sentence and the acquittal of God. 'All the people that heard him, the publicans and the sinners, justified God, being baptised with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptised of him' (Luke 7.29 f). To justify the death-sentence of God, but then also to justify the acquittal of God, in spite of our own Self, that is conversion. Even to our acquittal the word must be applied: 'My proud heart has never desired it.' We prefer to remain in our misery, because it is part of our own Self. But we stand under God's command: 'Reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom. 6.11).

To be converted, therefore, means to understand, acknowledge and justify the decision which God has made for us. It means to accept the judgment: thy life counts no longer, but Christ is thy life. Conversion means being acquitted of one's Self and learning to look away from the Self. It means to receive the assurance of salvation, and 'to get a merciful God' (Luther). It means to know Christ truly.

Perhaps this objection is raised: 'I should like to be converted, but I don't know how to do it.'

I know a seeker after God who once asked Elias Schenk this question: 'How can I get certainty about my salvation?' He who asked was the son of converted Christians. Schenk replied: 'I would thank God from the bottom of my heart.' A strange reply, but it is the only really helpful answer to the question. 'Look what God has done for you! Hearken to His Word which has called you! For you are "pure for the Word's sake" and "He has purified our hearts by faith". Take to heart the Word of God that is addressed to you, and you will learn to believe.' Does not this Word which is addressed to us enter our hearts always afresh?

All the stories about conversion experiences describe in similar words what changed the heart and determined the new life. Luther was converted by realising that the *iustitia Dei* is a *iustitia mere passiva*, that is to say the righteousness of God is a gift, it is something that has happened to us, and not anything that can be acquired by us. This was made clear to him by a word from Holy Scripture: 'The just shall live by faith' (Rom. 1.17). Another hears a live voice, saying: 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved' (Acts 2.21; Rom. 10.13). Again another is called by the words of the hymn:

> And though my heart a thousand times reject Thee,
> Thy saving Word for ever will assure me.

Another realised the meaning of the old Reformation saying, that sheer trust is a gift, offered to us in the Word of God. It is said of Count Zinzendorf that the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper showed him for the first time what Christ really meant to him. A similar story is told of Count Pückler, whose name is well remembered in the Christian-community movement. Someone else was converted when the Sacrament of Baptism was made real and intelligible to him: in baptism the judgment is passed on us that our old man is drowned in Christ, and that Christ is our new life. We only need to comprehend and obey the judgment which is once for all pronounced over us, that is to say, we need to believe in the judgment of God.

Is such a conversion experience necessary? Everyone agrees that the experience of a particular moment of conversion is not essential. Conversions are possible without the recollection of any experience in a clearly defined moment. The answer is 'yes', for Christianity can never be taken for granted. We can learn to take our Christianity seriously only by realising that certain events are under God's ordaining power in our lives, and under His ordaining guidance, which helps us to hear His call. The place and manner are different in each individual case. The change may take a considerable part of our life-time. It may not be outwardly visible or it may constitute a sudden turn in our life.

Nevertheless one thing is certain: the expression 'He has always maintained the faith of his childhood' is hardly correct. Of course Christ presents to us adults the children as our example, for He refers to us adults in the saying: 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein' (Mark 10.15). No one who does not stand before God as a little, helpless child, can ever enter the world to come. It is possible that some children realise their helplessness even before God and therefore make us adults ashamed. In such children is revealed that which is written in Romans 7.9, 'I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died'. In the seventh chapter of Romans is described what happened to the first human beings in the Garden of Eden, and what happens again to everyone who is confronted with God's holy law. The truth of the story of the Fall is proved again and again by the way in which children understand it; children grasp, very quickly the meaning of Romans 7.19: 'The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.' But since this is the case, the expression 'maintaining a childlike faith' should be avoided. God cannot be encountered without the law that kills. Who can wholly comprehend the divine sentence of death? In most cases it becomes apparent only in adult life, what this sentence of death implies and how deeply it effects man.

Who understands that part of God's judgment by which the dead are made alive? We can find this re-creating Word of God in many forms, but we cannot do without the exhortation from man to man. The Bible as well as the Reformers and the testimony of Christians at all times are quite explicit about that. We need the exhortation of man, and this exhortation includes more than that we call 'the confessional'. It is, as Luther says, a mutual conversation and consolation between brethren.

We need this exhortation indeed by means of the confession and of words of assurance. Staupitz said to Luther in the convent at Erfurt: 'Not for imagined sins has Christ died', i.e. not for sins which we picture in our imagination, but for very real sins; and for this reason we can and ought to be 'each other's Christ'. We are directed to God's congregation, the 'holy Catholic Church', to embrace the faith, and to abide in the faith. Do we not in the same article of the creed profess 'the forgiveness of sins'? Through Christ the forgiveness of sins and the approach to God are given to us once for all, but only in the proclamation of the Word of God is that gift brought before our eyes.

The quest for conversion and the answer to this quest must never cease in the Church of God.

Martin Kähler described the achievement of Pietism as 'keeping awake the quest of the Reformation'. The question 'How can I get a merciful God?' must never be silenced in the Church. At certain times and in some places this question ceased to be asked. Will this question be asked anew? During our Lord's earthly ministry the sinners understood this question, but the righteous did not; for 'it was not for imagined sins that Christ died'. But whenever the call to conversion is answered, a genuine change of life takes place, which is the 'fruit' of conversion. John the Baptist talks of the fruit of conversion to the pious Jews; the Apostle Paul tells King Agrippa of works meet for repentance (Acts 26.20). What are these works? Everyday acts (Luke 3.1 ff)—not to lie, not to steal, not to blackmail and not to be discontented, service, sacrifice and love.

The question, How can a man be converted? will remain a living question only if the right answer is given. The answer to the question 'How can I get a merciful God?' is assurance of salvation. This assurance consists in our knowledge that God accepts us despite ourselves through the grace of Christ and for the sake of His own Word, calling us, just as we are, from death to life. We are told that to perceive, understand and believe this fact —that is conversion. The words of Galatians 2.20, 'I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me', are not a description of a higher state of the Christian life but a simple description of what conversion means—to ignore the Self and to count on Christ alone.

To be a Christian, therefore, means to practise daily and hourly that which we have seen and understood in our conversion. Everyone who engages in a fine sport, like swimming, or who plays the piano well, must first learn how to remain 'passive', that is to allow himself to be led. Of course this must constantly be practised; on it depends what is called 'skill' and 'art'. A more sublime illustration will make this still clearer: Human love and faithfulness between parents, children and friends and especially between husband and wife surely depend on special and unique experiences. These experiences may differ a great deal from each other. There is love at first sight, and there is slowly awakening love. In both cases it is necessary to keep fresh that which was given to us once; and that means to gain it anew, as if this were the first day. It is the same between God and us.

It is possible that someone before his conversion—without realising it—behaved better than afterwards. Perhaps he was faithful in that which God entrusted to him, without consciously having grasped the meaning of righteousness through Christ. On the other hand we might fall after conversion into dangers and errors, because we look upon our conversion as our own achievement or as an isolated event. Nevertheless we die, we believe, and we pray—not unto our conversion, but unto Christ.

In this great mercy I believe,
To this alone I ever pray.
For this I suffer in my need,
In this I'll hope on my last day.

Therefore we speak of our conversion with great awe and great joy. With great awe, 'lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth me to be, or that he heareth of me' (2 Cor. 12.6). Are the fruits of our conversion genuine? More important still: Is our whole life governed by the principle: 'Not

I but Christ'? Others and especially strangers see often much clearer than we do, what is contrary to our profession and to our faith.

Nevertheless we also speak of our conversion with great joy, 'Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand'. God has cast down those powers—sin, death and the accuser, which contested His rule. Therefore return to God—conversion is joy!

Having recalled many of Luther's sayings, let us now close with the first sentence of the Heidelberg Catechism:

'My only comfort in life and in death is, that I, with body and soul, both in life and in death, am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who with His precious blood has made full satisfaction for all my sins, and redeemed me from all the power of the devil; and so preserved me that without the will of my Father in heaven not a hair can fall from my head: yea and that all things must work together for my salvation. Wherefore by His Holy Spirit He also assures me of eternal life, and makes me heartily willing and ready henceforth to live unto Him.'

ST. MARK 16.1-8[1]

by THE REV. C. E. B. CRANFIELD

PART I

IN the first part of this article we shall have a look at several features of this passage: discussion of the empty tomb, of the discrepancies between our several sources, and of the question whether Mark intended to end his Gospel with 16.8, we reserve for the second part.

1. TO THE WOMEN FIRST

According to all four Gospels women were the first to receive the news of the Lord's resurrection. According to Matthew, the Markan appendix and John it was also a woman or women who first saw the risen Lord, though Luke[2] would seem to agree with Paul[3] in representing Peter as the first to see Him. Is this precedence of women in the Easter narratives of the Gospels significant?

In the first place, we may, of course, point out that the women had been relatively loyal to Jesus during the hours of His passion and it was their love and loyalty which brought them so early to the tomb, and love and loyalty received their reward. This is quite true so far as it goes. But perhaps Calvin was right in seeing more than this. He says: 'He (i.e. Christ) began with the women, and not only presented himself to be seen by them, but even gave them a commission to announce the gospel to the apostles, so as to become their instructors. This was intended, first, to chastise the indifference of the apostles, who were like persons half-dead with fear, while the women ran with alacrity to the sepulchre, and likewise obtained no ordinary reward. For though their design to anoint Christ, as if he were still dead, was not free from blame, still he forgave their weakness, and bestowed upon them distinguished honour, by taking away from men the apostolic office, and committing it to them for a short time. In this manner also he exhibited an instance of what Paul tells us, that he chooses those things which are foolish and weak in the world to abase the loftiness of the flesh.'[1]

---

[1] Based on a paper read to the Durham Lightfoot Society on the 25th April 1952, and to the Newcastle Presbytery Clerical Club on the 16th May 1952.

[2] Luke 24.34.

[3] 1 Cor. 15.5. Did Paul omit the women, because their testimony could hardly be expected to carry much weight with the Corinthians (cf. A. M. Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ*, p. 42)? Is it possibly a case of *magnus dormitat Homerus*—Paul himself indulging in *ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία*?

If we follow the clues provided by Calvin's comment, we shall try to see beyond the obvious secondary causes (the women's love and loyalty and their intention to anoint the Lord's body or to see the tomb[2]) and ask what is the significance of the fact that God enabled the women rather than the apostles to be thus loyal. To a Jew of the time the women would seem quite unsuitable for the precedence they actually had. In the Jewish Prayer Book the Jewish male thanks God that He has not made him an unbeliever, a woman or a slave, while the Talmud contains such sentences as 'Happy is he whose children are male, and alas for him whose children are female'[3] and (even more significant) 'Sooner let the words of the Law be burnt than delivered to women'.[4] But God chose, not the apostles, the future leaders of the Church, but the women, who according to the common view of the times were least suitable to receive such a revelation, to be the first recipients of the news of the Resurrection.[5] Surely Calvin was right in referring us to Paul's words: 'God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong; and the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose, yea and the things that are not, that he might bring to nought the things that are: that no flesh should glory before God.'[6] The significance of the women's precedence, then, is not that here at last woman comes to her own rightful place, her natural worth being at last discovered and appropriately recognised (though it is, of course, true that the Easter narrative is of the very highest importance for the Christian understanding of woman), but rather that God honours those whom the world (both pagan and Jewish) dishonoured, in order that no flesh, whether male or female, might glory before Him.

---

[1] *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (W. Pringle's translation), vol. 3, pp. 338 f.

[2] Matt. 28.1.

[3] b Qid. 82*b* quoted in TWzNT I.781.

[4] j Sota 19*a* 8 quoted in TWzNT I.782. For other reff. see this article by A. Oepke in TWzNT on γυνή.

[5] Cf. G. Friedrich in *Göttinger Predigt-Meditationen* 4/2, p. 135, who compares the part played by the shepherds at Christmas.

[6] 1 Cor. 1.27-29.

Calvin further sees here a definite chastising of the apostles —their office temporarily taken away from them and handed to the women. Again his insight is suggestive. Certainly the fact that the apostles were not the first to receive the news of the Resurrection is an element in the general picture of the Twelve which we get in this Gospel. Is it not also, even when we have made allowance for a distinction between the position of the apostles before and after their re-commissioning by the risen Lord, an eloquent reminder that the importance of the apostles lies not in their persons but in their testimony, and the true continuity of the Church in the Word and Sacraments rather than in the ministry? 'Do nothing without the bishop' may be an excellent rule—particularly, if the word 'bishop' be rightly understood—but right at the beginning of the Church's story God breaks it! To a Reformed Churchman that might well seem to be a warning against that loftiness of the flesh, which he suspects is in the last resort at the bottom of the claims which some denominations make for their ministries.

2. The Angel

That the 'young man' (νεανίσκος) of verse 5 is an angel is clear enough—*pace* Kirsopp Lake. So the other evangelists understood Mark.[1] What then is the significance of this Easter angel? Here very valuable help is to be gained from Karl Barth's extremely interesting and very thorough discussion of angels in the *Kirchliche Dogmatik* (3/3, pp. 426-608), of which the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse has given us an excellent brief account in a previous issue of this Journal.[2] Barth renounces with equal emphasis, on the one hand, all hankering after an ontology of the angels and, on the other, the theology that has no room for them or seeks to dismiss them with a bored shrug of the shoulders—*die Angelologie des müden Achselzuckens*, as he calls it.[1] We must follow Scripture and therefore we must take the angels seriously, while refraining from idle curiosity about those matters on which Scripture is eloquently silent. That means concentrating our attention on the *officium angelicum* and leaving the *natura angelica* alone. Barth sees the function of the angels as, above all, that of witnesses (*Zeugen*) of God's action. Their witness is pure, unadulterated, authentic, because they only exist in and for their service of God and have no history, purposes, successes or features of their own. They are content to be *reine Zeugen* and therein lies their glory. By their witness they serve God and His creation. They are present when God acts and speaks and accompany His gracious movement towards mankind. They represent for us the *mystery* of the biblical history. 'It is through their witness that it becomes so to speak technically possible and actual, that God really is present, speaks and acts in His earthly creation and at the same time is really knowable as God, and as such is honoured, loved and feared.'[2] Their altogether selfless witness, which is always pointing away from themselves to God, makes it possible for man to be aware of the *distance* of God from man *even in His presence* with man, or, to put it differently, makes it possible for man to realise the *mystery* of God—thus saving him from idolatry. Where the angels are no longer believed in, there we are in grave danger of forgetting the mystery of God and substituting for the real God, who *is* mysterious, a conveniently unmysterious idol.

---

[1] Matt. 28.2, *ἄγγελος Κυρίου*; Jn. 20.12, *δύο ἄγγελοι*; and as for Luke, 24.23 makes it clear that he meant angels by his *ἄνδρες δύο* in verse 4. Cf. *νεανίαι* in 2 Macc. 3.26, 33: verse 34 makes it clear that these *νεανίαι* are angels.

[2] 4/4, pp. 376-382.

Barth notes that we hear practically nothing of the angels throughout the whole central part of the Gospel story. They have a place in the narrative only where the action of God is either not yet or no longer *directly* visible.[3] So they figure in the narrative at Christmas and Easter, but hardly at all in between. Their figuring in the narrative is a sign that we have to do with what Barth calls (for want of a better word) 'saga' or 'legend'. He immediately makes clear the quite special and unusual sense in which he uses these terms. He does not mean fairy story or anything of that sort, but rather that which is not verifiable by ordinary historical methods. This is not at all the same as unhistorical. He does not mean that here we have to do with a myth that may be demythologised away or that these things did not happen, but that these things are unique and we have nothing else with which we can compare them and therefore we cannot verify them by ordinary historical methods. Sometimes God's action is not only in history but also of the same texture as ordinary historical events, e.g. the crucifixion of Jesus; but sometimes, while really taking place in history and so being truly historical, it is nevertheless not of the same texture as ordinary history but something unique and therefore unverifiable by us by historical methods.[1] The beginning and the end of the Gospel history are of this latter sort—historical in that they are true and actually happened in history, but at the same time of a different texture from ordinary historical events.

---

[1] Barth's attitude to those who seek to bow the angels off the stage is clear enough from such a sentence as the following: 'Eine geheimnislose, eine des Spiegels der sich selbst repräsentierenden Gottheit entbehrende und also eine engellose Frömmigkeit und Theologie wird sich im Grunde immer als eine gottlose Theologie erweisen' (op. cit., p. 558).

[2] op. cit. p. 567.

[3] This does not mean that in the central stretch of the Gospel history they are not present. Of course they are present as God's witnesses there most certainly, but they are like candles that are not noticed in the midday sun.

In the Resurrection narrative itself there is a beginning, middle and end. The middle is Christ's own appearances, and here the angels do not figure in the narrative. They only figure before and after His appearances. It is an angel (Mark's *νεανίσκος*) who first makes the first human witnesses aware of the *fact* of the Resurrection. The open and empty tomb by itself is not enough[2]; it is a sign that needs an explanation, and the angel gives the needed explanation. In none of the Gospels does the risen Lord show Himself directly to His own until the angel has appeared and spoken. But in the actual event of the Resurrection the angel has no part—not even Matthew's angel. The angel is there, not to share in God's action but to testify to it. He sees and is the first in the series of witnesses. He bids the women pass on the message, but it seems that his command is ineffective until Jesus Himself appears to confirm it.[3] By itself the angel's command is not enough: without Jesus' own appearance the message does not go forth. What then does the angel accomplish? His presence serves to *characterise* the event, to indicate its uniqueness, the *mystery* of the presence and activity of God upon earth. It serves to make clear to us both the distance from us and the nearness to us of this event that has just taken place, to impress upon us *both* that it concerns us most intimately and is the gracious nearness of God to us *and* that it is something utterly mysterious and beyond our labelling, pigeon-holing and 'getting taped'.

---

[1] In this connexion it is interesting to contrast the relative success of paintings of the Crucifixion with the relative ineffectiveness of pictures of the Resurrection—e.g. Matthias Grünewald's Isenheim *Crucifixion* and Isenheim *Resurrection*.

[2] On the obvious apparent exception, John 20.2-9, see Barth, op. cit., p. 594.

[3] See Part II of this article on the discrepancies between the various narratives.

Barth quotes some suggestive words from Calvin: the angels *in suo ministerio, velut in speculo, divinitatem aliqua ex parte nobis repraesentant.*[1] Men were not permitted to see the event of the Resurrection itself. None of our Gospels presumes to describe that. But the angel did see it. Angels were present (as always since their creation) at God's action. So the angel's word to the women, 'he is risen' (ἠγέρθη), is as it were the mirror (cf. *velut in speculo*) in which men are allowed to behold the reflection of this eschatological event. Not directly, but indirectly, through the mirror of the angel's testimony, do the women behold. But this mirror is not one that distorts, for the angel's witness is pure, unadulterated and authentic witness. So the angel serves as a connexion that is thoroughly reliable between man and that which man may not see. Man may not see the face of God and live; and yet life is precisely to know God. By means of the angel's testimony the event of the Resurrection in its infinite graciousness toward men and in its infinite mystery and majesty is made known to men. Compare what Barth says about the Angel of Yahweh: he has 'the character of a perfect mirror of God, in which He, whose face no man can behold, nevertheless becomes visible'.[2]

We may also compare 1 Cor. 13.12, behind which lies the Rabbis' exegesis of Num. 12.8.[3] It is indirectly (ἐν αἰνίγματι) that the women behold the mystery and majesty of God's act, but the medium through which they see, the angel's testimony, is a reliable and undistorting mirror, so that they see with real clarity and certainty, even though indirectly. And after them the whole Christian Church gazes through the same glass. Compare also the words addressed to Moses in Exod. 33.19-23: 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee. . . . Thou canst not see my face; for man shall not see me and live. . . . Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock;

---

[1] *Institutio*, I.14.5.

[2] op. cit., p. 574.

[3] See *S.J.T.* 5/1, p. 57, last paragraph of note continued from previous page.

and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand until I have passed by: and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back: but my face shall not be seen.'

So the angel at the tomb is very intimately connected with the Messianic hiddenness, with the indirectness of God's self-revelation. Revelation goes far enough to make faith possible, but not so far as to make faith impossible.[1] To those who had not yet come to have any measure of faith in Jesus the news of His Resurrection comes only on the lips of fellow men. Any other way would, it would seem, make *faith* impossible. Neither the risen Lord nor the angel appears to them. To those who were already disciples the risen Lord appears—but for the most part in quite unspectacular and homely guise. But He does not appear without warning. The angel first makes the necessary preparation, so that the nature of the risen One may be rightly interpreted, the distance and mystery of God even in His gracious nearness recognised, and the living Christ worshipped as God and not as an idol. He does this by being the mirror through which the actual event of the Resurrection, that which may not be witnessed by human eyes, is made visible.

3. 'And Peter'

What is the significance of the special mention of Peter in verse 7? Are we to say with F. Hauck that Peter is hereby exalted as the leader of the disciples after Jesus' Ascension[2] or with Calvin that Peter is particularly mentioned 'not because he was at that time higher in rank than the others, but because his crime, which was so disgraceful, needed peculiar consolation to assure him that Christ had not cast him off'?[3] Thomas Aquinas quotes Jerome and Gregory the Great in support of the latter interpretation.[4] Theophylact mentions both explanations as alternatives.[5] Lagrange wants to have both together, though he says that the former (that Peter is chief of the apostles) is the more natural.[6] But, if the special mention of

---

[1] Cf. *S.J.T.* 5/1, pp. 60-66.

[2] *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Theol. Handkommentar zum NT), 1931, *ad loc.*

[3] *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (W. Pringle's trans.) vol. 3, pp. 344 f.

[4] *Catena Aurea* ad loc.

[5] Quoted in M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (4th ed., 1928, reprinted 1947), p. 447.

[6] ibid.

Peter were intended to mark him out as the chief of the apostles, would not the order of the words have been different—'Peter and the other disciples' rather than what we have? It is best to take it as a message of restoration to the disciple, who had denied his Lord,[1] and to hear in it also a message of restoration to ourselves after our denials of Christ.

4. GALILEE

What has just been said assumed that 16.7 is authentic. This has, of course, been questioned. J. Wellhausen suggested that it was an interpolation added in order to cover up the disgraceful flight of the disciples into Galilee (for this verse implies that they were still in Jerusalem) and to serve as a transition to the idea which later became dominant, that the disciples had remained in Jerusalem altogether.[2] Meyer and Creed agree that the verse is an interpolation—though, whereas Wellhausen apparently thought of it as an interpolation into Mark or an *Urmarcus*, Meyer and Creed mean an interpolation by Mark into his material.[3] But there does not seem to be any adequate reason for regarding the verse as secondary.

We have next to ask what exactly is meant by 'goeth before you'. Are we to take the προ in προάγει to refer to time or to place? Johannes Weiss, as is well-known, took it in the latter sense—of place. Jesus will now march as victor at the head of His followers (just as in 10.32 we saw Him marching at their head in the opposite direction) and lead them into Galilee, where the establishment of the kingdom of God is expected. But Lohmeyer's point that 'there shall ye see him' implies that they will *not* see Him on the way and therefore that He will not march at their head,[4] seems to be decisive in favour of taking the προ to refer to time rather than place.

The next question is: Why Galilee, and what is the meaning of ὄψεσθε? And what a lot of fun the exegetes have had with this! Augustine gives an allegorical interpretation. 'Galilee', he says, 'means either *transmigratio* or *revelatio*'—apparently he derives it from the Hebrew root גלה. So first he takes the meaning *transmigratio* and explains that the verse signifies that the grace of Christ is about to transmigrate from Israel to the gentiles and the Lord will go before His disciples to prepare the hearts of the gentiles to receive the Gospel and they will see Him among the gentiles, for they will find among them the members of His body . . . and so on.[1] Gregory the Great similarly starts from the supposed meaning of the name Galilee: *Galilaea namque transmigratio facta interpretatur. Iam quippe Redemptor noster a passione ad resurrectionem, a morte ad vitam . . . . transmigraverat. Et prius post resurrectionem in Galilaea a discipulis videtur, quia resurrectionis eius gloriam post laeti videbimus, si modo a vitiis ad virtutum celsitudinem transmigramus. Qui ergo in sepulcro nuntiatur, in transmigratione ostenditur, quia is qui in mortificatione carnis agnoscitur, in transmigratione mentis videtur.*[2]

---

[1] Perhaps there is some support for this view in the fact that in 14.27-31 Christ's prediction of Peter's denials and His promise that He will go before them into Galilee come together.

[2] *Das Evangelium Marci* (2nd ed.) ad loc.

[3] J. M. Creed, 'The Conclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark' in *J.T.S.* vol. xxxi, pp. 175-180.

[4] *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1937), p. 356.

Lohmeyer (in his commentary on Mark and more fully in his *Galiläa und Jerusalem*[3]) has a most interesting explanation. He thinks that the double tradition of the Resurrection appearances (Galilee and Jerusalem) is to be explained by the existence of two streams of primitive Christianity (represented most clearly by Mark and Luke-Acts respectively), for one of which the centre of interest is Galilee, which is regarded as *terra christiana*, the main scene of the Lord's earthly life and ministry and destined to be the land of eschatological fulfilment, the scene of His soon-expected Parousia. According to Lohmeyer the leadership of this Galilean Christianity lay with the Lord's family. The reason why there is no mention of Galilee in Acts 1.8 is that it was regarded as *terra christiana* and therefore there was no need for apostles to preach there. Characteristic of this Galilean Christianity were the following: belief in Jesus as Son of Man, expectation of His speedy return, a strict observance of the Mosaic Law, an ideal of poverty (reflected, Lohmeyer thinks, in Mark 10.17 ff) and absence of any emphasis on the Holy Spirit. He thinks that it is reflected in the Epistle of James. The other stream of early Christianity thought of Jesus especially as Messiah and Son of David and for that reason regarded Jerusalem as the centre of interest. In this tradition we see the idea of a world-wide mission based on Jerusalem (he notes how Paul always returns to Jerusalem) and made possible by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit associated with Jesus' Messiahship. The leadership of this Jerusalem-centred Christianity rested with the Twelve. But the two streams were not mutually exclusive. The most obvious instance of their merging is the position held by James, the Lord's brother, in Jerusalem from the time of Stephen's appointment. From that time the Twelve *as such* disappear from the narrative of Acts and their place is taken by 'the Apostles', at whose head is James, the Lord's brother, who was never one of the Twelve.

---

[1] *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, xliii, sect. iii, part 4, pp. 391 f.

[2] *Homiliae in Evangelia*, xxi.5, (In Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXXVI, 1172) quoted by Aquinas, *Catena Aurea*, ad loc.

[3] Published in 1936.

The reference to Galilee in Mark 14.28 and 16.7 Lohmeyer understands as connected with the belief that Galilee was the land of eschatological fulfilment. The words 'you will see him' in 16.7 must refer, he thinks, to something that can only happen in Galilee; and, as a proof of the Resurrection could be given anywhere, this must refer to the Parousia. He supports this conclusion by arguing that the active voice of the verb ὁρᾶν is specially used in the New Testament with reference to the Parousia. The fear of the women is the fear associated elsewhere in the Bible with the last day; it is fear at the news that the Parousia is so near. This is certainly a most interesting exegesis and in the course of his discussion Lohmeyer makes many fascinating suggestions about the problems of early Christian history (e.g. that the use of the title 'Lord' of Jesus has its origin in the Galilean Son of Man Christology); but the foundations of his exegesis are precarious. As Dr V. Taylor points out, 'The question, Why must resurrection appearances be connected with Galilee?, can be applied equally to the Parousia.'[1] As Dr Taylor notes, in Test. Zeb. 9.8, it is expected to happen in Jerusalem, not Galilee. Moreover, Lohmeyer hardly proves his point about the verb 'to see'. He himself admits that the passive is used regularly of the Resurrection appearances and in 1 Cor. 9.1 the active appears to be used of Paul's seeing the risen Lord. There is also the point made by a German reviewer of Lohmeyer referred to by Professor R. H. Lightfoot[2]: that if 'you will see' referred to the Parousia, then 'goeth before' would be an unnatural expression, since the Son of Man was expected to come from heaven on the clouds, not from Jerusalem with His disciples. We conclude that Lohmeyer's suggestion can hardly be sustained.

---

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1952), p. 608.

[2] *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (1938), p. 76.

Professor Lightfoot (in his *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*) was clearly impressed by Lohmeyer's arguments. Though he was obviously a little wary about accepting the contention that 'you will see' must refer to the Parousia, he comes to the conclusion that Mark is inviting his readers 'to discern in the angel's message a reference rather to the appearance of the Son of Man himself than to a passing revelation of the risen Christ'. And Professor A. M. Ramsey seems also to have come to some sort of acceptance of this idea; for he says in *The Resurrection of Christ:* 'Mark seems to tell of the Resurrection as the Parousia: the day of the Son of Man.'[1] Professor Lightfoot has now altered his position somewhat. He says in *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* that the appendix (pp. 106-116) in some points corrects the argument in chapter seven and also in his earlier book, to which we have already referred. He suggests that the significance of the reference to Galilee in 14.28 and 16.7 is to be understood in the light of the associations of Galilee in the earlier chapters of the Gospel. There the multitude in Galilee represents Jesus' work, the salvation of the world. He concludes: 'If this interpretation of our second Gospel is correct, the great importance and significance of the reference to Galilee in 14.28 and 16.7 become apparent. For there the disciples have a work awaiting them, and in it their Lord will still lead the way for them, as He did before; what He did, when He was with them, He will still do in and through their work for Him . . . the reader's thought is turned back to the story of the ministry in the early chapters of the book, and he perceives that this is also the ministry to be fulfilled henceforth by the Lord (Himself no longer hampered or restricted, as in the days of His flesh) in and through His disciples, who now represent Him in the world. . . .'[2] Similar is Professor Ramsey's tentative statement that Jesus' saying perhaps 'had a meaning symbolical rather than geographical and referred less to a place of meeting or journeying than to a Victory and a Mission that would follow the disaster of the Cross'.[3] There is an interesting similarity between this interpretation and Augustine's allegorical interpretation quoted above.

---

[1] p. 88.

[2] p. 116.

[3] op. cit., p. 71.

Calvin's matter-of-fact suggestions afford an interesting contrast with these modern interpretations. 'When the angel sent the disciples into Galilee, he did so, I think, in order that Christ might make himself known to a greater number of persons; for we know that he lived a long time in Galilee. He intended also to give his followers greater liberty, that by the very circumstances of their retirement they might gradually acquire courage. Besides, by their being accustomed to the places, they were aided in recognising their Master with greater certainty; for it was proper to adopt every method of confirming them, that nothing might be wanting to complete the certainty of their faith.'[1]

To sum up our conclusions on 16.7—we see no reason why there should not have been appearances both in Jerusalem and in Galilee during the forty days[2]; we take this verse to be authentic and to refer not to the Parousia but to a Resurrection appearance. That Galilee may well have had some such associations as Professor Lightfoot suggests, we readily admit, and that there would seem to be a special fitness in the missionary charge of Matt. 28.16-20 being given in 'Galilee of the Gentiles'; but we see no need to dissolve this verse into mere symbolism. Some such reasons as Calvin suggests would be adequate to explain why Christ should wish to appear to His disciples in Galilee.

5. THE WOMEN'S FEAR AND SILENCE

Verse 8 is specially interesting. The statement 'they said nothing to any one'—on the surface a very surprising sequel to the angel's command in verse 7—is peculiar to Mark. Both Matthew and Luke give the sort of sequel we should expect. Matthew tells us that the women 'ran to bring his disciples word', while Luke says, they 'returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest'. Presumably Mark meant his words to be understood in a limited sense—their silence was only for a little while. Calvin comments: 'Though they were resolved to obey the angel, still they had not power to do so, if the Lord Himself had not loosed their tongues.'[1] It is interesting to note, as Barth points out,[2] that in Matthew the women do not actually give the message until after the Lord Himself has appeared to them and repeated it, while in Luke, though they deliver their message, it is not believed by the apostles till Jesus appears to them. But Mark gives special prominence to this silence of the women. So it is something which requires some explanation.

---

[1] op. cit., p. 345.

[2] cf. Ramsey, op. cit., p. 71.

One explanation that has been suggested is that, since Paul does not mention the empty tomb in 1 Cor. 15, the narrative of its discovery must be a late creation of the Church and the silence of the women in Mark is an attempt to account for the fact that the story had not been circulated earlier. But even Kirsopp Lake agrees that Paul's sequence 'died . . . was buried . . . hath been raised . . .' implies belief that the tomb was empty; and, moreover, since Paul is not here setting out to persuade the Corinthians of the truth of Christ's resurrection (for he appeals to it as to something which they already believe), there was no reason why he should recite every detail of the story.

Another explanation, which we only mention in parenthesis for the sake of its quaintness, is that of Severian of Gabala as quoted by Aquinas in the *Catena Aurea*. He says: *Signanter etiam dicitur, quod nemini quicquam dixerunt, quia mulieribus audire, non loqui datum est, discere, non docere.* It is surprising that with such sentiments Severian was so popular with Eudoxia and her ladies!

So we turn to the reason Mark himself gives in the words 'for they were afraid'. It seems unlikely that this was fear of the Jews or fear of not being believed or of being thought mad, as some have suggested; for Mark has already piled up words expressing fear and amazement—'they were amazed' (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν), 'be not amazed' (μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε), 'fled' (ἔφυγον), 'trembling' (τρόμος), and 'astonishment' (ἔκστασις), and these clearly refer to the fear aroused by their experience at the tomb. It is better therefore to assume that the last expression ('they were afraid'—ἐφοβοῦντο) refers to this same fear. It is also mentioned in Matt. 28.5, ('fear not ye', says the angel to the women) and 28.8 ('with fear and great joy'). But in Matthew the mention of the women's fear has been toned down—particularly by being coupled with 'great joy'. This fear is also referred to in Luke 24.5 ('they were affrighted').

---

[1] op. cit. 347.

[2] *Kirchliche Dogmatik* 3/3, p. 595.

What then is the meaning of this fear and why does Mark so emphasise it? First we should notice how often expressions denoting either fear or amazement occur in this Gospel in connexion with the works and words and presence of Jesus. The following are examples: 1.27, 4.41, 6.50, 9.15, 32, 10.24, 32, 12.17, 15.5. Professor Lightfoot very rightly stresses the religious nature of this fear: it is that fear of God, that is the beginning of wisdom.[1]

Mark's emphasis is a very necessary antidote against all sentimentalising of Easter. It points to the fact that the reassurance which the Easter message brings is a reassurance on the other side of a radical disturbing of all our security and self-assurance. The 'great joy' of which Matthew speaks lies on the far side of this 'fear' and 'amazement', and we can be sure that any so-called Easter joy that is on this side of it is bogus and counterfeit. For here is something which calls in question the things which we take for granted. This is no mere resuscitation of a Lazarus, though that is disturbing enough! This is not a restoring to a life that once more must succumb to death. This is indeed realised eschatology, for the resurrection of the dead belongs to the End. But in one way or another we try to come to terms with the Resurrection of Jesus, to strike a bargain with it, so to speak, on the most advantageous terms possible. We try to treat it as a familiar piece of our mental furniture, to make ourselves think that we are quite at home with it. We may perhaps regard it as a sort of emblem of man's immortality or connect it with the annual renewal of nature in the spring. Easter has suffered almost if not quite as much as Christmas from its 'atmosphere' and associations.[2] Again and again, though in many different ways, we make the futile attempt to reduce the immeasurable, the eschatological, to the measure of our mental capacity and emotional convenience. It may be by preaching about the beauties of spring—but spring is a particularly unfortunate illustration of Easter, for it illustrates the opposite to what the Gospel proclaims; for spring is followed by summer and autumn and then winter, new life by a further dying, whereas 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more',[1] and the one thing is something general and natural and familiar, while the other is the miracle that turns the world upside down. Or it may be by drawing off attention on to the 'atmosphere' and associations, as when a church inanely advertises its Easter services as a 'festival of white flowers'! Mark's account just does not fit into this sort of picture at all; for in the sentimentalised Easter there is no room for that fear to which he gives such prominence. If all that the women had seen was the token of a particular instance of some general principle, an illustration of life after death after the fashion of the spring, or anything of that sort, they would hardly have fled in such terror. What they had seen was the token, the traces, of the direct intervention of God, indeed of God's final intervention, for here the End, the last things, confronted them in the midst of this present world. So Mark's account (more emphatically than any of the others) warns us against trying to by-pass the fear or ignore it. The message of Easter is indeed a message of real, superb, present joy, but joy in the context of this fear and awe.

---

[1] *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 97.

[2] Cf. M. Niemöller, *The Gestapo Defied* (28 sermons translated and published in Britain in 1941), pp. 154-163.

The tendency to sentimentalise the Resurrection is no new phenomenon of modern times. It appears to have been present from the beginning. Does not John 20.17 refer to it? And perhaps Schniewind is right in seeing a touch of it in the Matthew account of the earthquake and the effect on the guards. It is a beginning of sentimentalisation, *if* it does reduce the Resurrection to the level of a portent, of a merely frightening event that belongs to this world and this order. Schniewind says: 'We are given here something in the way of a direct account of the Resurrection; Matthew alone of the canonical Gospels does this. It is only in Matthew that the indescribable is described, while in Mark and Luke only the appearance of the angel is related and the accomplished fact of the empty tomb. It seems as if according to Matthew the women are actually witnesses of the earthquake and the mighty act of the angel. Here as also in the narrative of the guard at the tomb we meet the tendency to speak of the mystery of the risen One in an objective way (*objektiv*) as though this were merely a datum on the same level as all earthly data.'[1] But Matthew does not necessarily imply that the women saw the rolling away of the stone and it is significant that he too avoids attempting to describe the actual event of the Resurrection and does not suggest that it was witnessed by human eyes. However, whether or not we think that Schniewind is fair to Matthew here, it is certainly true that this tendency was to become very strong later on. We see it in the Codex Bobbiensis variant of Mark 16.4 and in the second-century Gospel of Peter, in which the centurion and the soldiers and the elders, who are also depicted as keeping watch, see 'three men come out of the sepulchre, and two of them sustaining the other, and a cross following after them. . . .'[2] Over against the Markan account this sort of thing surely represents a *Verharmlosung* of the mystery of the Resurrection, which is what we mean by 'sentimentalisation'. In the canonical Gospels, with the (to the present writer) very doubtful exception of Matthew, there is nothing to suggest that the *event* of the Resurrection was directly experienced by any human being or that any but believers were allowed to see either the angel or risen Lord.

---

[1] Rom. 6.9.

The effect of the fear upon the women is that (for the time being) they tell no one. Their silence both underlines the significance of their fear and of the Event, the traces of which they had seen, and also is a pointer to the fact that the proclamation of the Gospel is not a mere human work, but a miracle. It is parallel with the public silence of the apostles until Pentecost. Mark has already recorded the miracle of the healing of the deaf-mute[3] and placed it significantly in relation to Peter's confession. We cannot hear the Word of God until God opens our ears; we cannot confess Christ or proclaim the Gospel until God looses our tongues.

But there is something else that must be said about this silence of the women. The evangelist, who has so emphasised the hiddenness of the Messiah in the days of His flesh or (to put it otherwise) the indirectness of revelation, has in this passage underlined something that is different from that Messianic hiddenness and yet closely related to it. There is a wisdom of silence which we despise at our peril, because it is a *sine qua non* for the right understanding of Holy Scripture. We mean that, while we are under divine constraint to proclaim the Gospel, we need nevertheless to be on our guard against glibness. It would not be a bad thing, if the words 'they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid' were written on the walls of theological lecture-rooms and in the pulpits of our churches! 'Let every man be swift to hear, *slow to speak*. . . .' says St. James and 'Be not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment.'[1] The Gospel must be preached and theological work must be done; but to undertake it lightly and without a due sense of fear and responsibility is the mark of a fool. The theologians' playground is after all not a playground at all! It is a dangerous pastime to try to show off our cleverness at the expense of the mystery of God, and in these matters it is idle folly to imagine that we may have everything nicely and neatly explained and, so to speak, 'buttoned up'. The silence of the women is a warning against superficiality and glibness in theology, a reminder that those who would expound the Bible need humility and the sense of the mystery and immeasurability and unspeakableness of God and of their own sinfulness and frailty. We take it that Isaac Watts had this in mind, when he wrote[2]:

---

[1] *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, pp. 276 f.

[2] M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 92.

[3] 7.31-37.

> God is in heaven, and men below;
> Be short our tunes, our words be few;
> A sacred reverence checks our songs,
> And praise sits silent on our tongues.

---

[1] James 1.19, 3.1.

[2] No doubt with Eccles. 5.2 in mind.

BOOK REVIEWS

Marcion and His Influences. By E. C. BLACKMAN, B.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

TO THE student of Church history Marcion will always be an enigmatic but intriguing figure. By the sheer force of his convictions he compelled the Church leaders of his day to declare the faith that was in them, and decades after his exodus the great guns of Tertullian were still thundering against the heresiarch's words, works, and churches. For Marcion had his churches: *habet plane et evangelium Marcionis ecclesias, sed suas, tam posteras quam adulteras* (Adv. Marc. 4, 5). To no ordinary mortal or even heresiarch would so great an attention have been accorded, but Marcion was not ordinary. Ideas commonplace enough in that syncretistic age were in his case united to extraordinary force of character and to an audacious innovating energy which led him, in an age when the structure of the Church was still inchoate, to propose to precipitate its development by offering his own ideas as the standard of Catholicism. When the Roman Church rejected his overtures in A.D. 144, Marcion, not tarrying for reform from within, set up a new Church. What, he asked the Roman presbyters, was the new cloth which was not to be sewn on to the old coat? This schismatic set, more than any of the speculative ideas inherent in Gnosticism, awoke the Church to the dangers of the hour and revealed Marcion as the arch-heretic.

Mr Blackman starts with Marcion's Church, and in successive chapters studies Marcion's intromissions with regard to scripture in the Church, the New Testament text, the doctrine of two Gods, Christology, the Pauline gospel, and the authority of the Old Testament. Everywhere his standard of reference, apart from the original authorities, is Harnack's great monograph *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1921), which he pronounces 'the one indispensable work apart from the ancient authors'. Nevertheless he considers that Harnack has at many points 'estimated too highly the significance of the great second-century nonconformist'. It is the signal merit of his lucid and searching study that it does reveal the disproportions of Harnack's valuations, and that in a way which brings out the justice, wisdom, and constructive character of the Church's reaction to Marcion's headiness. He leaves him, however, the credit of having, more than any other single person in history, compelled the Church at one of its great formative periods to recognise the cardinal significance of St. Paul. But for Marcion the Catholic Church might conceivably, though not probably, have left the Pauline writings out of the Canon. Nevertheless the Church was painfully conscious that Marcion turned a blind eye to revelation and to history. It had to insist on a broader basis for its theology than Marcion. But the attention called to the great apostle of the Gentiles was salutary and determinative.

Marcion's Church was proclaimed as a supernatural creation, the true Catholic Church, the Bride of Christ and Mother of the redeemed. In the matters of government, worship, and sacraments there was not much to differentiate the Marcionite communion from the one Marcion had left. It had its bishops, presbyters, and catechumens. It had its own buildings not always easy to distinguish from more orthodox places of worship. It observed the same holy days and the same sacraments as the larger Church. A more democratic flavour, indeed, attached to its organisation, and there was a larger extension of official spiritual functions to laymen and to women. Justin Martyr in A.D. 150 could speak of it as spread over the whole Empire. Celsus, in his time, recognises only two important Christian communions—the Catholic and the Marcionite. But while Marcionitism was one of the great influences which forced the Church to a fuller declaration of its character and claims, Mr Blackman dissents from Harnack's view that Marcion may be regarded as the originator of the conception and form of the Catholic Church. Though the organisation from which he dissented was still only a loose federation of Christian communities, Mr Blackman takes refuge in Harnack's own admission that Catholicism was at least embryonic already in the New Testament writings. But that Marcion gave an *Anstoss* to the unfolding of its potentialities may be taken as certain.

It was characteristic of Marcion's creation that it rested not on prophetic revelation to an individual—like the Montanist movement—but on a book. Marcion 'offered men a book which, of itself, would teach them what the Gospel was'. He held that the apostles, apart from St. Paul, had judaised, had apostatised from the truth. *Apostolos praevaricationis et simultationis suspectos . . . usque ad evangelii depravationem* (Tert., adv. Marc. 4, 3), *apostolis admuscisse ea quae sunt legalia salvatoris verbis* (Iren., Haer. 3, 13, 2). None but Paul had held to the truth. Therefore Marcion's proposed canon of authoritative Christian scriptures and his rectification of the text. Mr Blackman allows that Marcion introduced the first fixed canon of Christian writings, but he rejects Harnack's claim that he was the 'creator' of the Catholic canon which in its two sections of

Gospel and Apostle was already implicit in universal Christian thought and usage. On the subject of Marcion's criticism of the text of his selected books Mr Blackman has written some very useful pages. His basic text was Western, and the mass of readings peculiar to him are 'dogmatically neutral, i.e. not introduced by Marcion in the interest of his doctrines'. Whatever influences his readings exercised on the general tradition of the NT text, 'the more palpable Marcionite alterations did not insinuate themselves'.

Mr Blackman has devoted a considerable section of his book to Marcion's theology, his dualism, his Christological ideas, and the character of his soteriology. Tracing the origin of his peculiar dualism, he recognises Marcion's debt to Cerdo, but he thinks that the emphasis on the newness of the Gospel was Marcion's own. Marcion's dualism was not professedly a product of philosophy, but claimed to be rooted in his apprehension of religion. The warrant for the distinction of the Redeemer-God from the Creator was formed by him in his Gospel and was confirmed by his Apostolikon. Mr Blackman insists, however, that the conception of a God who is a Stranger to the universe, and who intervenes catastrophically in Christ to redeem mankind, was an extravagance and a travesty of the Gospel which is not to be explained apart from the influences and extraneous ideas on his mind. Moreover his theology emphasised redemption to the complete elimination of cosmology and of history. Tertullian could therefore put the question: *Unde haec dimidiatio salutis nisi ex defectione bonitatis?* Is a God perfectly good whose salvation leaves out man's body and ignores the cosmos? Then there is the docetic Christology of Marcion. For Marcion the flesh of man, being essentially earthy, could not be a dwelling-place for the Divine. At this point, as elsewhere, the truth would seem to be that Marcion brought an *a priori* conception of God and man, a derivative of Hellenistic-Oriental religious philosophy, to the understanding of Christianity. He read this conception into the teaching of St. Paul himself. Tertullian declares that *Separatio legis et evangelii* was the *proprium et principale opus Marcionis*. But while the Pauline antithesis of Law and Gospel was 'welded on to Marcion's theology', it was, as Mr Blackman says, of 'a different metal'.

It is not possible to cover more fully the contents of this masterly work. Enough, it is hoped, has been said to indicate the range and character of Mr Blackman's interests. He has laid the student of early Church history and of the New Testament literature under a debt which can at best be repaid by close first-hand acquaintance with the detail of the work. The book is a masterpiece in its province which merits to be very widely read and acknowledged.

W. Manson

Das Urchristentum. Im Rahmen der antiken Religionen. By Rudolf Bultmann. Zürich, Artemis-Verlag. 260 pp.

The eminence—and indeed the notoriety—of Professor Bultmann in certain provinces of modern Biblical and dogmatic controversy are certain to attract to this little volume a more than ordinary degree of attention. And this is to be greatly desired, all the more because here—for once—the reader will not encounter controversy or polemic. He is offered the calm results, the stored harvest of a quiet mind, which, here at least, is sufficiently at leisure from itself to stand back and view its subject—original Christianity—against the background of the manifold cultures of its age. Here Bultmann is able to combine acute and trenchant analysis with broad generalisation. He recognises that Christianity, cradled in Judaism and deriving essential elements of its life-force from further back in the ancestral Hebrew religion, was not a pure product of historical development but a new creation with a meaning and a stamp of its own. Equally he recognises that when in its nascent period this Christianity had to breast the strong onflowing tides of Greek philosophical thought and Oriental astral religion and mystery, it was able to ride the wave in virtue of its inherent force and genius. Nevertheless, in order to meet the challenge of these other cultures and religions, Christianity had to take over their problems, above all the problems which connected with the understanding of personal human existence, with the nature of man, the world, and God. Professor Bultmann will, therefore, in the present volume keep to the front the existential significance of Christianity, that character or element in it in virtue of which, today as in the first century, it plants its central challenge at the heart of personal life—*tua res agitur!*

Dr Bultmann, pursuing his inquiry into the various answers given by religion to the fundamental problems of man, the world, and God, takes up first the Old Testament legacy to Christianity, then Judaism, then the inheritance from the Greek side, and then the later Hellenism. In a fifth chapter he considers Early Christianity itself. Dr Bultmann's characterisations are masterly and limited to essentials. He ministers to our understanding, which cannot be said of every writer who has worked on these subjects. For example, his analysis of the religion of the Old Testament really helps to light up the rise of eschatology in Israel, because it explains it from within. Again, when he comes to later Judaism, where all thought is centred in a book, he exposes, again from within, the nature of the profound alteration which comes over religion. Prophets and priests of the past had stood rooted in history, but could this be said of the Scribes?

Legalistic Judaism becomes detached from living history and from the living God. Hence the artificiality of the scribal tradition. 'God is no more in a genuine sense the God of history.' Religion and religious practice are *entgeschichtlicht*. It is at this point, and in this context, that Dr Bultmann brings in the preaching and the eschatological message of Jesus.

Yet, as Dr Bultmann sees it, the separation of God from history and the world, which had taken place in later Judaism, is continued but with a difference, in Jesus. 'For Jesus too', he writes, 'God no longer reveals Himself in world-history.' Nor is man apprehended as involved in history in the old sense. But there is this difference that, whereas in Judaism God's transcendence meant His remoteness, His separateness from man, in Jesus that transcendence means rather the tremendous nearness of God to man's spirit, the immediacy of the impact of His will on man irrespectively of the contingencies of his world-situation. Judgment and salvation are, to this extent, de-historified. As man is brought by Jesus face to face with God's demand and grace—as, for example, in the command to love—it is revealed that man's only real future is God: all history for man is now centred in God: God in Christ is transcendent in the sense that He is the Coming One, the Ever Coming One, and man's 'openness' or surrender to His will is the essential condition of all future history for him. So at least it would seem that Dr Bultmann's difficult language at this point is to be construed. In any case, it is in terms of such an understanding of eschatology that Dr Bultmann in the final chapter of his book seeks to bring out the nature of the Christian redemption *vis-à-vis* the notions prevalent in the mystery-redemption of Hellenistic gnosis.

In the chapters on the Greek inheritance and on Hellenism Dr Bultmann steers a course parallel with his analysis of the Old Testament religion and Judaism. And here too he is concerned with the fundamental problems of man's understanding of his own existence in relation to the world and God. A very valuable section of the book is the trenchant and balanced comparison which is drawn between (1) the rational religious instinct native to Hellenism, according to which salvation lies in man's adjustment to this world, and (2) the irrational world-flight characteristic of the redemption-myth of Gnosticism. Here Dr Bultmann sees both likeness and difference between the Christian and the Gnostic ways of conceiving man's deliverance. There is, on the one hand, a vast unlikeness between a redemption which, based on the idea of the essential divineness of an element in man, proposes to save that element in him, while abandoning the rest of his nature together with history and the world, and a redemption which, based not on man at all but solely on God's gracious action in Christ, claims and saves the whole of man, and at the same time leaves the door open also for history and the world since the whole future belongs to God. On the other hand, the Gnostic myth comes close to Christianity in so far as the latter is rooted in the certainty of a *present* salvation, in the assurance that the eschatological event—the coming of God—has already become present event. Contemporary modes of Hellenistic-Oriental thought may well have assisted at this point the full unfolding in Christianity of a sense of what had come to it in Christ. But all this can only be thought out to full results by a close study of Dr Bultmann's own pages. Suffice it to say that he has written for us a very notable book which is certain to reward all who will grapple with it.

W. Manson

German Protestantism Since Luther. By Andrew L. Drummond. Epworth Press, 1951. 282 pp. 22s. 6d. net.

Dr Drummond is a historical scholar of remarkable range who has already put us in his debt by the publication of a number of useful studies in widely separated fields. *Edward Irving and His Circle* was a really valuable contribution; and though there is less in *The Church Architecture of Protestantism* and *The Story of American Protestantism* that cannot be found elsewhere, each brings together the relevant material within moderate compass and in a most helpful way—and the last-mentioned has been cordially welcomed in the United States as well as in this country.

From the same learned pen we now have this admirably complete survey of the changing fortunes of Protestantism in Germany following on the work of the first reformers and down to the present day. In no other single English volume, and hardly in a single German one, is the story told with such completeness, such wealth of accurate detail, and withal so readably. Naturally enough, it is of the Lutheran tradition that we hear most throughout, yet full justice is done to the Calvinist or Reformed strain, and equally full account is given of those movements of thought and life which, though having only slender roots in the original Reformation impulse, developed within the Protestant community.

The first half of the work surveys the changing forms of doctrine and piety. We are first invited to observe how the free spirit of the first reformers was constricted in the immediate sequel into a rigid doctrinal orthodoxy that was as scholastic in its own way as that of the Schoolmen against which Luther had so violently reacted, and when, as Herder said, 'every leaf of the tree of life was so dissected that the dryads wept for mercy'.

Next comes the early period of Lutheran liberalism, beginning with Calixtus who, in the first half of the seventeenth century, already 'saw the dangers of unphilosophical religiosity as well as the dangers of unreligious philosophy', and taking us down to Comenius, the 'incorrigible optimist' whose 'confidence in human nature irradiated a world theologically darkened by exaggerated dogmas of the Fall'. Next follows the Pietist movement, providing its own very different leaven and, under the influence of such men as Spener, Francke, Gottfried Arnold, Bengel and Zinzendorf, traversing the existing opposition of liberal and reactionary. Then we read of the *Aufklärung* and its rationalism; and following this of the Romantic revival and the influence of Schleiermacher and Hegel. The two final chapters in this half of the book are entitled respectively 'From Hegel to Harnack' and 'From Harnack to Barth', with each of a large number of well-known names assigned to its rightful place in the story. It is perhaps rather an annalist's than a theologian's (or philosopher's) account of the whole development that is here offered us. For a more penetrating analysis of the profound issues concerned in it the student must go to other books. To mention only one minor example, Ferdinand Kattenbusch's *Von Schleiermacher zu Ritschl* will provide (especially in its later and enlarged form) a much deeper understanding of that particular sequence of thought than we can gain from Dr Drummond's pages. It would, however, be unfair to expect so much from so general a treatment as this.

The second half of the book traces the changing forms of Church organisation, the relations of Church and State, and of Church and world. Excellent account is given of the working of the territorial system of the *Landeskirchen* from the Peace of Augsburg downwards to the struggles of the Hitler period. Its inherent weaknesses are well displayed, though the treatment is nowhere unsympathetic. The differing attitudes of the various Hohenzollern emperors are clearly explained, as are also the movements towards a more socially-conscious form of Christianity in the nineteenth century. Clear account is given of the rise and progress of the *Innere Mission*; the account of the Nazi period is likewise clear, and seems accurate.

The book is elaborately documented, if chiefly by reference to secondary sources. Dr Drummond appears to have read everything that other scholars have written and he manages always to squeeze in a footnote somewhere (sometimes even a little irrelevantly) to show what he has read. For a book which includes so much detail, the slips are not many: but there are misprints on pages 13, 62n, 151 (where Herrmann's name is misspelt), 152, 174 and 221.

JOHN BAILLIE

La Vie en Christ, by Théo Preiss. Delachaux et Niestlé. pp. xix + 200. 1951.

By the death of Théo Preiss (hastened by his war experiences) the Reformed Church of France lost a considerable theologian. This volume of his papers which has just come to hand with an introductory study of the man and his work by his colleague at Strasbourg, Roger Mehl, reveals everywhere the signs of a theological intelligence at once lively and profound.

The volume, as we have it, is divided into three parts, but is introduced by a moving little essay entitled *Souffrir avec Christ*, written in a sanatorium a few months before Preiss' death. In it he returns most poignantly to a theme which had long engaged him—the individual Christian's communion with and participation in the sufferings of Christ. His most considerable contribution to theology is undoubtedly contained in the first block of papers which immediately follows. This section includes a study of the *imitatio Christi* in St. Ignatius of Antioch over against Pauline teaching, an examination of the Johannine theology of justification, an exposition of the social ethics of the epistle to Philemon, a long study of the idea of the Son of Man in Matthew 25, and an essay on the Christian vision of history.

Mehl rightly in his introduction, stresses the intensity of Preiss' concern with ethical problems. His study of Philemon, contributed to a *Festschrift* for Maurice Goguel, follows almost inevitably the profound and minute analysis of Matthew 25.31-46, in the preceding essay. It was Preiss' hope to produce a large-scale work on the idea of the Son of Man, which would, if we can catch its outline from what we have here, have been a kind of counterpart in Reformed theology to Mersch's three works on the Catholic understanding of the Mystical Body of Christ. In his study of the 'sheep and the goats' pericope, he recognises the theological profundity of Mersch's exegesis of the passage, but insists that it must be disciplined at once Christologically and eschatologically by means of a proper concept of substitution: and this concept, he argues, we will only be able to frame if we have penetrated the deeps of the Son of Man Christology and the mysteries of the Second Adam. (It is interesting to compare his discussion of these matters with that of Dr Austin Farrer in some of the most valuable chapters in his *Study in St. Mark*.)

Preiss' theological thought is aided here as elsewhere by a minute exegesis of the Biblical text; but it is directed always to rescuing Reformed theology from any taint of individualism. This comes out strongly in the remarkable essay on the juridical element in the

Fourth Gospel, focussed by the fundamental theme of *μαρτυρία*. Preiss argues that if we look below the surface in John, we find the same issues as occupy Paul in Galatians and Romans, but rescued in their treatment from too intimate concentration on the issue of the status of the Jewish law. Briefly he sees raised by the Johannine theology the question of the validity of juridical categories in Christology and soteriology as such: he argues that their use is not only permissive but indispensable; only of course in our employment of them we must allow their interpenetration by other categories also fundamental in their field of application. We misunderstand their force if we employ them in isolation; we must follow the example of the fourth Evangelist who effected in his Christological exposition a veritable *περχώρησις* of the most superficially disparate notions, fusing together the mystical and the juridical.

In the first essay in this group, Preiss devotes himself to the particular issue of the Christian approach to death, as suggested by Paul on the one side and by Ignatius of Antioch on the other. It raises in the most acute way some of the underlying differences between the Catholic and the Protestant understanding of the Christian life. In a valuable treatise on *Le Sens de la Vie Monastique* (Editions Brépols, 1951), R. P. Louis Bouyer introduces the illuminating phrase *humanisme eschatologique*; for him as for Preiss eschatology and Christology are woven indisseverably together as the background of ethics, and we could imagine that the Strasbourg Protestant might have welcomed the phrase of the Oratorian as a description of what in these essays he is trying to characterise. But he would not have allowed the claims made by Père Bouyer for the monastic life; and he would perhaps have smiled to see them introduced by the quotation of precisely those sentiments in Ignatius which he had most concern to criticise. Yet the fact remains: that in their work both Bouyer and Preiss are posing the ethical question Christologically and eschatologically. They recognise man's besetting concern with the problem how he shall live; both alike, without being existentialists, recognise that theological issues are existential, touching the stuff of a man's response to life, and that they are raised most acutely when a man recognises on his pulses that he must die.

I mention Bouyer's work here alongside Preiss', because their confrontation seems to me a sample of the sort of ecumenical confronting that is most urgently needed. Our discussions concerning the ministry tend to reach an impasse: or rather seem somehow to by-pass the ultimately divisive issues, which may be suddenly focussed by a play like Eliot's *Cocktail Party* more effectively, more sharply, more tragically than ever by the *non possumus* of professional ecclesiastics.[1] But theological work like Preiss', with its combination of scholarship and buoyancy, takes one right to the heart of the matter; and although the issues become more difficult, they also become more exciting; for they are brought to rest in the single all-inclusive problem of the *mysterium Christi* and of our relation to Him. Thus they become suddenly concrete, related now somehow not simply to committee-room or even place of worship, but also to such burning *cruces* of our present human existence as the moral legitimacy of the methods of war to which we have allowed the Americans commit us in Korea. Preiss (and Bouyer too in his way) help us to see that the way forward ecumenically may be a renewed effort by Catholic and Reformed alike to define the sense each gives to the radicalism of the Cross.

In the second and third sections of the book we have studies of a slightly different character. In the second we have three papers: one on the Aramaic origin of John 8.30-36, a second, dated 1948, on the much canvassed question whether the Last Supper was or was not a Paschal meal, and the third some notes on the problem of infant Baptism communicated to a commission of the Reformed Church of France, and inevitably dealing with the kind of issues raised in the well-known writings of Cullmann and Barth. These papers are in a way, more technical; yet they abound in theological judgment expressed with a veritable *clarté Cartésienne*. There is a real elegance in Preiss' style. One passage on the Eucharist I cannot forbear from quoting as a sample of the peculiar freshness and distinction of his work (the translation is my own):

'The Sacraments are much less, for the first Christians, a victory over the gulf that separates spirit and matter—(yet that is what they have become for so many centuries now at such an awful cost in pseudo-problems and false alternatives!)—than a victory over the tension in time between the present age and the age that comes in Jesus Christ. We are hypnotised by the problem of the relation between the living Christ and the elements of bread and wine, and in consequence we put our questions in terms of abstract spatial relations that leave time out of account in a way much more hellenistic than Biblical. We treat the Eucharist as if it were a rite without a date making actual the myth of a mystery-religion: we just don't let ourselves see that we must pose our problems less in terms of space than of time' (pp. 124 f).

All this is surely profoundly suggestive if only as offering new vistas on complex and delicate controversies. I would add that

---

[1] I do not forget the sociological grounds of division emphasised by Christopher Dawson, and more recently by Dr C. H. Dodd, and also of course perennially by the Marxists. But the sociological and the ethical are closely related.

Preiss prefaces his notes on Baptism by some wise remarks (even though I judge his use of the term 'nominalism' misplaced) on the unwisdom of seeking a general definition of *sacramentum* (pp. 137 f).

To the third section belong studies of the missionary work of the Church, of art in relation to creation, of the method of theological teaching of today and a remarkable address delivered in 1943 on the task of the Church *vis-à-vis* the nation. This should, I think, be read in close conjunction with his study of the Christian vision of history in the first part. Here again in view of recent discussion concerning the Lordship of Christ, I cannot forbear a quotation: 'It is the Church's prayer which sustains the world: without it, the world would crumble. But this prayer itself is only made possible, and only enjoys reality, life and strength by virtue of the prayer and abiding intercession of the Lord. He is the Atlas who carries the world on His shoulders at the same time as He bears kingly rule over it. Let us note in passing that His royal dominion and His prayer for the world are things that cannot be separated' (p. 173). That is profoundly as well as beautifully said, and supplies a note far too often omitted by those whose contributions to the 'Christian understanding of history' is bare of deep Christological information (as perhaps Reinhold Niebuhr's may increasingly be judged to be).

Preiss' work is sadly slight in bulk: but in content it possesses a genuine profundity. Often minute, always exquisitely clear, it touches surely and searchingly real issues. No one can read these essays without a sense of gratitude as well as regret, and all who do, not least those who cannot make the author's position entirely their own, will surely receive lasting illumination concerning the problems with which Christian theologians must engage.

D. M. MacKinnon

The Epistle to the Hebrews, An Historical and Theological Reconsideration.
By William Manson, D.D. Hodder & Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Few books in the New Testament have suffered more from their interpreters than the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. From very early times it was given a severely Platonic interpretation which wrenched it from its Biblical roots and twisted its message into an alien significance, although that has largely dominated the understanding of it ever since. The older criticism at least took the Epistle to be a stage in the development of Jewish Christianity, but recent criticism has detached it from its historical setting and has sought to understand it theologically and historically in terms of Hellenistic Christianity. The outstanding exception in the history of its interpretation is John Calvin. Along with the *Epistle to the Romans*, he held it to be theologically the most significant in the New Testament, and made it determinative for the whole of his Christology and eschatology.

Although he does not mention Calvin, Professor Manson has given us a study which stands in that high tradition. Without doubt this is an epoch-making book in New Testament studies, not only because it throws a flood of light upon many of the most baffling problems in the study of Christian origins, but because it cuts cleanly and decisively through the Platonic misinterpretation of Hebrews, and against the trend of modern criticism puts the Epistle back in its theological and historical setting in the Biblical *Heilsgeschichte* and in the world-mission of the Church. To this great merit belongs Professor Manson's discussion of the complexity of early Christian history and of the diversities of thought and sympathy which co-existed in the average congregation of the first-century Church, and his insistence, therefore, that if we are to get the full measure of the Apostolic message preached to the world in the first century Hebrews and Romans must be read together as dual and complementary witnesses. As it is put later in the volume: 'Just as St. Paul cannot think of faith except as faith in the God of the resurrection, so for the writer to the Hebrews Jesus is *Priest of the Resurrection* and inaugurator of a "better" hope by which we draw near to God.'

In this historical and theological reconsideration Professor Manson has 'sought an approach to Hebrews which will (1) integrate the Epistle afresh into the history of the world-mission from its inception in Stephen, (2) re-evaluate the potentialities of the religious situation in such a centre of world-mission Christianity as Rome, (3) trace the connexion between the doctrine of Hebrews and the theology of the world-mission as a whole, and (4) from careful study of the argument of the Epistle establish conclusions as to the situation and character of the community and so recover for the Epistle its organic position in relation to first-century evangelism and life.'

In discussing the problem of the Epistle and its treatment by scholars, Professor Manson finds that neither the older nor the more recent interpretation has done adequate justice to the *eschatology* of the Epistle. By that he means 'its supreme concentration of interest on the critical finality of the moment of time in which Christians are placed by the Gospel. For the writer to the Hebrews this moment is one which permits no dallying and no turning of the eyes backwards. He sees all things in the light of the crisis brought about by the announcement of the Eternal World in Jesus and the swift approach of the end of the present order, including the Last Judgment. He believes with the Johannine writer that "It is the last Hour", with St. Paul that "The time is foreshortened . . . the fashion of this world is passing away". Eschatology in this sense is a determination of mind or attitude according to which all life and all history are judged purely as they relate to that Ultimate Event towards which all things are now fast hastening.'

That brings Professor Manson to examine in the second chapter the relation in which the eschatology and Christological doctrine of the Epistle stand to the world-mission of Christianity. A fresh study of the Stephen-records in the Acts of the Apostles reveals a remarkable parallel between the teaching of the proto-martyr and that of the writer to the Hebrews. From Stephen's witness to the transcendence of Jesus over the Law and the sacrificial order of the past, and his concentration on the eschatological calling of the Church 'to leave the Temple and all that went with it behind, no longer clinging to historical securities, no longer thinking to capitalise the grace of God in the Jewish ordinances and cultus, but throwing in its lot with the crucified Son of Man,' to go out moving forward toward Christ to whom the throne of the world and the Lordship of the Age to Come belonged, proclaiming Him to every nation and people, a straight line is seen to run to the more elaborate interpretation of the same theme in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The next three chapters contain a careful examination of the relevant material in the Epistle as it bears upon this main issue, and here we are given a most exciting and supremely great discussion of the central message of Hebrews regarding the eschatological life, its doctrinal teaching of the person and office of the Redeemer, and the oblation of the Body of Christ. The exposition which Professor Manson gives is clear, trenchant and compelling, while his translations of the text are superb in their choice of language and their illumination of the content. At the same time it becomes increasingly clear that here is a theology rising out of the heart of this Epistle which gathers up the whole of the New Testament teaching into a profound unity. Further, the argument advanced so powerfully from page to page substantiates the convictions reached in the first two chapters and throws considerable light upon the purpose and circumstances of the Epistle, which Professor Manson concludes was addressed to a minority group of Jewish-Christians, in the Church at Rome, which was lapsing from the strength and purity of its eschatological hope owing to influences affecting it from the side of Judaism. These matters are gathered together in the final chapter, where we are also given a penetrating account of the relation of Hebrews to Romans and to the Old Testament.

It is with the central theological discussion in this volume that we are mainly concerned here, where sheer scientific faithfulness to the actual text has cleared away many impediments to our understanding, and where Professor Manson expounds so clearly and profoundly the teaching of the writer to the Hebrews with his characteristic integration of Christology, atonement and world-mission, and of the eschatological and liturgical life of the people of God. There is space to mention only two points of outstanding importance.

The first concerns the relation between the thought of Hebrews and 'Alexandrianism', a feature, says Dr Manson, which has not seldom been mis-appraised. Due recognition is given here to the Alexandrian Jewish theology as the background against which the conception of the Two Worlds in the Epistle to the Hebrews is elaborated, but it is pointed out that the concern of the writer of Hebrews is not with cosmology but with redemption, and therefore his exposition of the heavenly sanctuary is put into entire subservience to his exposition of the sacrifice and atoning work of Jesus within the veil. 'Not the nature of reality, but the advent of the End is the dominating concern of the writer. For him the eternal world stands essentially in front of us, *impending* on us as immediate apocalyptic event, and if he brings in the idea of its present heavenly circumstance, it is because Jesus has already gone into the world of light as our "Forerunner". He has placed the "anchor" of our souls there on the other side of the "veil". He atones and intercedes for us there, and our souls are summoned to rise to the full height of their eschatological calling.' If therefore some use is made in this Epistle of 'Alexandrian' language, it is put to a very different purpose, for 'the sustained counterpoint of earthly shadow and heavenly reality' is not to be understood in terms of the relation between the phenomenal and the noumenal, but in terms of eschatology. 'Shadow may suggest something which is unreal or even deceptive in the Platonic philosophy. But the writer to the Hebrews is not primarily a Platonic idealist but an eschatologist, and when he says that the Law had in it the shadow of the Christian order, though not the reality, he means that the new order was at hand, at the door, projecting itself on the plane of the Old Testament history, announcing its advent. The history of the Law, and the cultus of Israel were to this extent witnesses in advance to the Christian salvation.' It must be further noted, that 'the apocalyptic distinction between the Two Ages of time crossed by the idealist antithesis of the Two Worlds of reality, has not been absorbed into or lost in the latter. . . . He does not break with the apocalyptic hope even in an unconscious way. The eternal world, in breaking into time in the Incarnation of the Saviour, does not cease to be the eternal world. The curve of its intersection with the world of time is—to use a mathematical illustration—like the parabola or hyperbola which, coming from infinity, recedes again into infinity. One focus, represented by the Incarnation and Atonement-sacrifice of Jesus, has appeared in time. The other, represented by the Second Advent, lies wholly beyond. But the writer's eyes are fixed in its direction. "He will appear the second time—no more to deal with sin—for the salvation of those who await Him. In ever so short a time now the Coming One will arrive, He will linger no more." That the writer can relate eternity and time in the way he does gives us the measure of his faith, but he does so relate them.'

The second point concerns the relation between the liturgical and the eschatological life of the Church, between the altar and the world-mission. What is the Christian altar? 'It certainly lies beyond the bounds of the terrestrial Jerusalem, and it is the altar of the Saviour's martyrdom. We must therefore "go out" to Jesus, to where He was crucified "outside the camp", and must take our share of the shame He bore. . . .' And here the writer is given a supreme chance to assert once again the eschatological character of the Christian calling. 'Let us go out to Him, outside the camp . . . for we have here no permanent city, but we seek the one to come. This going out—the putting into practice of the great watch-word of Stephen and the world-mission—is the true Christian approach to the altar; the sharing of the reproach of Christ is the true Christian communion of the altar.'

Enough has been said to indicate the very great worth of this book, which together with Professor Manson's *Jesus the Messiah*, must rank among the most penetrating studies of the New Testament in our times. Professor Manson retires this month from the Chair in Edinburgh which he has held so long with such distinction, but if his retiral means that he will be able to pursue his theme and give us a parallel (and greatly needed) theological and historical reconsideration of the *Epistle to the Romans*, then the way will be clear on the basis of such a twin study to build up a true and full theology of the New Testament. Certainly in this book Professor Manson has shown that of all men in our day he is to be regarded as the authoritative guide to our understanding of New Testament teaching.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

In The End, God . . . A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things.
By JOHN A. T. ROBINSON. 128 pp. James Clarke. 6s.

IT IS eloquent of the theological climate that No. 4 in a series of books called *Theology for Modern Men* should be about eschatology. Dr Robinson, besides being a writer with rare gifts for addressing modern men, is an admirable theologian. He is familiar with the important books, mainly in German, which have carried the discussion of eschatology to the point it has now reached; and he moves, with penetrating understanding and deep concern, among those who, so significantly in our day have 'breathed again the atmosphere of Christian eschatology, who in a tired and drab world have sniffed the clean, crisp air of the Advent message and the Advent hymn'. Better still, he has made available for the first time in English theological literature, the fundamental theses which are involved in this discussion. Whatever may be the effect of the book outside theological circles (and it ought to be far-reaching), there is no longer any excuse for ignorance of, or indifference to, this theme which has become so central in Biblical and Dogmatic theology.

In the Introduction and the first chapter entitled 'The Modern Mind', he takes the measure of the theological task in this field of dogma. He notes that interest has been sustained in only one department of eschatological thought, that which treats of the hopes and prospects of the individual after death; and he explains how different is the emphasis of that eschatology in which the Bible is soaked. He sees, however, the danger that 'we shall be left, like Schweitzer, to make the best of a situation where Biblical theology requires us to interpret the Gospel in categories that are confessedly fantastic and false for the modern world. And to rest there is either to abandon the Gospel as dated and irrelevant, or to sever it from all ties to its historic foundation' (p. 21).

The root of the matter is the prophetic conviction that ultimate truth will be established in final fact. This conviction was sustained by the apocalyptists, who, while refusing the Hellenic temptation to abandon hope in the future for knowledge of the timeless, made the further point that the end and meaning which history moves towards is something that history cannot itself embody. Once this is said, it is notoriously difficult to keep a firm grasp on eschatological categories and not slide off into Hellenic concepts of a timeless eternity. Dr Robinson's exposition of *Kairos* and *Chronos* is the most skilful and incisive remedy against this danger that I have yet seen. He makes it clear that the finalising *Kairos* is not bound up in simple correspondence with a chronological *finis*, whether that be the moment of death or the temporal end of history. Therefore we can understand the New Testament affirmation that the *Eschaton* has arrived; or rather that the *Eschatos*, the Last Adam in whom God has finally asserted Himself to be God, has been enacted.

To maintain the finality of the Gospel events, in a situation where time has not come to an end, the New Testament proclaims the coming *Parousia*; and it is here that the difficulties begin. The apparatus employed by Dr Robinson for dealing with them includes (*a*) Dr Alan Richardson's version of theology as an empirical science, (*b*) Dr Dodd's emphasis on realised eschatology, (*c*) Dr Brunner's version of the Divine-Human Encounter. Thus equipped, he takes the trouble to establish precisely what he means by the term *myth*. He means a working picture, used for the purpose of translating our fundamental understanding of God, given and verified in present experience, into terms of the primal and ultimate, where it *must* apply and yet where direct evidence is, in the nature of the case, unobtainable (p. 34). He is able, with this category, to face the need which has arisen for dissociating the Christian hope from belief in a *literal Parousia*, just as at an earlier stage it was dissociated from the expectation of an *immediate* Advent. Dr Robinson is honest, and respects the authority of the Bible. He says, therefore, that 'in a pre-scientific age no distinction between myth and history was made —or required. St. Paul, as presumably Jesus, undoubtedly thought of the Fall and the Last Judgment as literal events. But that did not prevent the Apostle uncovering the real significance of both myths. Such a failure to distinguish does not seriously distort the New Testament message' (p. 70). I wonder whether the New Testament writers would be so lenient with Dr Robinson and some of his consultants.

The chapters which follow on 'The End of Man' and 'The Resurrection of the Body' are admirable in conception and execution. The inadequacies are exposed in doctrines of survival or of immortality, and the significance of the doctrine of resurrection is clearly brought out. The central argument which clarifies the preaching of *bodily* resurrection is that for the Hebrew, individuality does not depend on the body as with the Greeks, but rests in the individuating Word of God. The body is a function of solidarity, and once this is seen, the precise bearing of the complex affirmations in St. Paul's thought can be traced out with intellectual satisfaction. The exegesis of the passages from the Corinthian letters is open to criticism, but here as elsewhere throughout the book, Dr Robinson has provided material of first-class value for further discussion in English.

The last two chapters appeared in this journal for June 1949 under the title 'Universalism—is it heretical?', to which Dr Torrance replied in the September number. Pp. 119-122 may perhaps be taken as additional argument in view of Dr Torrance's criticism. It would seem, to the present reviewer, that Dr Robinson has not quite seen the force of the charge brought on p.313 of the September number, that he was systematising the illogical. 'The contradiction (between man in guilt and God) is resolved only by an act of God in which man in contradiction to God is reconciled and yet the terrible bottomless reality of sin is not denied. That act of God is ultimately eschatological, so that just how the contradiction is dealt with in atonement is yet to be revealed at the *Parousia*.' The issue seems to be between those who find in Christ crucified an *Eschaton* which makes all things plain, and those to whom that *Eschaton* is still a dreadful enigma before which they nonetheless must say *O Crux, ave, spes unica*. Let it be quite clear that this is an important, and deeply religious book, and one that will make a unique contribution to an understanding of these issues in this country. But I hope it will not be Dr Robinson's last word on the subject.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE

Why we are Christians. An Interpretation of the Apostles' Creed. By the REV. J. S. MCEWEN, B.D. Church of Scotland Publications Committee. 1s.

THIS is altogether a most excellent little book of Church theology, which it is a joy and inspiration to read both because of its lucid straightforward exposition of the faith and because it is both *didache* and *kerygma* in the truest sense of those New Testament terms. It is designed for those Church members who want to strengthen their intellectual grasp of the faith they already hold in their hearts by explaining in simple terms the profound beliefs of the Church. In carrying out that purpose Mr McEwen interprets the Apostles' Creed clause by clause in a way that both instructs and creates conviction. He has given us a book which is a faithful and thoroughly reliable guide and which one can commend with the utmost confidence to the Church member. Published by the Church of Scotland for this very purpose, it is worthy to take its place alongside of *The Preparation for Christ in the Old Testament* by the late Professor A. C. Welch, and *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* by Professor J. S. Stewart.

In the Introduction Mr McEwen compares the Creed with those tattered, blood-stained banners that hang in some Cathedrals, flags that led our soldiers into battle in bygone days, and under whose shadow they fought and died. 'For the Creed is the battle-standard of the Christian Church. It is almost as old as Christianity itself. It is stained with the blood of martyrs who died for the faith it enshrines. It began as a battle-standard and is still a battle-standard: for whenever the Church comes into conflict with the unbelief of the world, the Creed, and the beliefs contained in the Creed, are found in the thickest of the fight.'

In this vigorous, robust perspective Mr McEwen goes on to point out that the Creed proclaims divine actions, not human opinions. 'This means that there is something about the Creed that is beyond our criticism or discussion—something to which we can only say a humble and reverent "Amen": for when God speaks and acts it is not for man to discuss, but to believe and obey. Yet that is not to say that the Creed must simply be "swallowed" without discussion or criticism. It declares divine acts which are not subject to human criticism, but it declares them in stammering and imperfect human language which may be criticised, or conceivably improved. . . . We may judge and criticise the language of the Creed as much as we think fit, but we must realise that these frail words point beyond themselves to God as He has revealed Himself to men in Jesus Christ: and that is something we do not judge. On the contrary it is we who are judged by it' (p. 13 f).

In regard to faith in God the Father Almighty, it is pointed out with great power that though belief in God is put before belief in Christ by the Creed, that does not mean that we judge Christ by what we think we already know about God, for all we think we know about God we submit to the judgment of Christ. 'Christianity therefore maintains a wise scepticism concerning all human assertions about God' (p. 16). 'All that we *imagined* we knew about God before we meet Christ, has to be torn down and rebuilt from the very foundation in the light of what we learn from Christ. . . . Faith in Jesus Christ is the starting point of the Christian life, and the foundation of all true knowledge of God' (p. 24). Here, then, we have reproduced the essentially Christological and Christocentric character of faith in God which, as Professor Cullmann has recently shown, dominated the historical development and structure of the Apostles' Creed.

Mr McEwen is equally good in his expounding of the second part of the Creed, belief in Christ, with particularly helpful passages on why God revealed Himself in a way that did not *compel* men to accept the revelation as true but in such a way as to evoke trust and love, on the heretical notion that there is a divine spark in man which really does away with the unlikeness between Christ and ourselves, on the Virgin birth which stresses Christ's kinship with us and yet tells us that the birth of Jesus was God becoming Man, and not Man becoming God. What is said at this point has definite relevance for the Church today. 'The doctrine of the Virgin Birth has demanded from men, throughout the ages, an acknowledgment that the life of Jesus began with miracle, as it ends with miracle. *The absence of a human father is an outward sign pointing to a deeper and greater miracle*—that here God became Man and began to live a human life. If we drop belief in the Virgin Birth and learn to speak of the birth of Jesus as a normal and natural event, on its human side at least, can we be certain that the deeper miracle of God's entry into human life in the child Jesus will be remembered? Is it not all too probable that when the outward miracle is discarded the inner miracle to which it so arrestingly points will tend to be increasingly ignored? . . . A little touch of "heresy" may do little or no harm to us who live our short tale of years in an atmosphere of prevailing orthodoxy. That same touch of heresy, if made the official teaching of the Church, *might* work untold havoc in the course of two or three generations' (p. 37 f).

The 'descent into hell' might have benefited from Calvin's exposition, but the accent is rightly laid throughout this section on the resurrection of Jesus Christ and His exaltation to divine rule at the right hand of the Father. There follows an excellent account of the doctrine of the Spirit and His work, not to make us conscious of Himself, but to reveal Christ and to enact that revelation within us. At this point it might have been helpful to have applied the doctrine of the Virgin Birth analogically to the significance of faith, and the New Testament teaching of our union with Christ. Nevertheless this is a powerful section which is particularly welcome at a point where modern theology is decidedly lame.

The teaching about the Church reflects the characteristic eschatological note of the Early Church and the early Fathers, though there is nothing in these pages about Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The statement that 'the Church will cease to exist' in the perfected Kingdom of God, is rather puzzling. No doubt it will cease to exist in its historical and institutional form, but it is then when at the great Marriage Supper of the Lamb the Bride becomes one with her Lord that she finally becomes the Church as the Body of Christ. She is that Body already in faith and in sacramental anticipation of the *Parousia*, but she still awaits the consummation, when she will enter the fulness of the Kingdom as the perfect community in a perfect environment. The Church can no more cease to be the Church than the Humanity of Christ will cease to be. But I suspect that my difference with the author at this point is really one of terminology, for he goes on to point out that the notion of the Kingdom entails the notion of *community life*—the life of a redeemed society of men and women (p. 76).

There is no space to explore further the wealth of thought and teaching which packs these eighty-seven pages. Throughout them all Mr McEwen shows a theological mind at once humble and masterly. To my knowledge, no better work of this kind exists in English. It is to be hoped that having given us this simple yet profound exposition of the Apostles' Creed for the Church member, he will go on like Calvin to enlarge it into a new *Institutes* for the theologian.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by ALAN RICHARDSON, D.D. S.C.M. Press, 1950. 25s.

IT IS no easy task to produce a book of this kind which both measures up to the critical standards of the Biblical scholar and meets the pressing need of the minister at work in his study upon sermon preparation. There can be no doubt, however, that Canon Richardson and his colleagues have done admirably, and produced a volume which the preacher will find quite invaluable for his daily work. It has come at the right time, just when the pulpit is beginning to be restored to its old glory, and expository sermons are being preached to feed and nourish the flock of Jesus Christ. The minister who keeps this book on his desk and uses it regularly will find a good guide in his interpretation of the key words of the Bible, and will be saved from many misunderstandings.

It is inevitable in a work of this kind that selection will leave out words in which some have peculiar interest, and inevitable also that the articles on those words selected for exposition should be somewhat uneven. The learned editor has done rightly in giving 'Jesus' as a word but a small space, for the world could not contain the volumes that might be written about it theologically. Other words, however, are clearly inadequately dealt with, such as *just*, *justification*, etc. Others again have disproportionate space given to them, but no one who reads the long illuminating articles by Professor Marsh on *Time*, or Professor Hendry on *Reveal*, or Professor North on *Sacrifice*, will complain of that. There is unevenness also in theological power. Some contributors are clearly lacking in theological acumen though their scholarship may be exact and careful, while others are less exact, and lack a real understanding of the Old Testament background, which New Testament scholars today are finding so absolutely necessary for their task. Not all articles give a bibliography, and not a few contributors who have appended a bibliography are apparently ignorant of important works in America and on the Continent. On the other hand, the articles by C. E. B. Cranfield are almost a model of what is wanted in a work of this kind, while the Editor himself has contributed a great deal of useful material.

Apart from these criticisms it must be said that the work on the whole exceeds expectation, and goes very far to filling a great gap in our library. Those who read German will still turn to Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, if they have ready access to it, and have time to plough through its many pages, which also are very uneven in their power and exactitude, but no one can now afford to neglect this new Theological Word Book which is the most useful manual of its kind yet to appear in English. The S.C.M. Press, as well as the Editor, are to be congratulated on its production, for they have done the Church a real service.

Thomas F. Torrance

The Gospel of God. By Anders Nygren. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

The reading of certain books is in itself a big religious experience. No doubt their number is small, but this gentle, calm, penetrating book thoroughly deserves to be included among them. All men about to be ordained to the Christian Ministry should read it, and others who have known the wear and tear of the ministry over a period of years might find in its few pages the instrument of their re-consecration.

The Bishop of Lund is justly described in the translator's preface as 'one of Europe's most widely known and best-loved Churchmen'. As a professor of theology and ethics he has written several important books, the best known of which to English readers is *Agape and Eros*, a study of the Christian doctrine of Love. Following the ancient custom of the Church in Sweden, on the assumption of the office of bishop, Dr Nygren prepared a pastoral letter for his diocese, and it now appears in this little book.

A man with his record of heroic witness is peculiarly entitled to begin his charge with a searching chapter on 'The peace of God in Jesus Christ', what it is, why it passes understanding, what makes it a thing of power, and how the full Gospel commission lies in the continual preaching of it. Then he proceeds to consider 'God's word of promise and admonition' in our call to be Christians. There is the same sacredness of call for all Christians, but he is primarily concerned with the special function for which ministers receive their vocation. The decisive word which designates the minister's special call and task is Herald. 'We are heralds—that and nothing else.' All other views of the ministry are false or superficial. The central emphasis must not be placed on the minister as priest, instructor, moral trainer, propagandist, spiritual guide, or reformer. All these conceptions, he believes, err in placing too much stress on the human agent and too little on the Divine Message, and accordingly they put the minister too much in the centre. The inherent difficulties of the minister's task are not overlooked, especially at this present moment in history—they are faced in two or three closing pages—but still it is a joyful and inspiring calling.

Possibly the best chapter is the third which examines the unique content and character of the Gospel. We have to herald decisive events which have taken place by the act of God in Jesus Christ—something which is of vital moment for all men to hear. Biblical realism, both in its pessimism and its hope, has to be presented to man in such terms as deliverance from alien, violent powers, the restoration of freedom, and the creation of the new humanity. The Gospel can only be presented to our faith in terms of the urgent 'now' of a decision which bears upon the whole complex of our own and the world's life. Only those who are steeped in the Bible can truly preach, not those who choose random texts to suit their own small range of ideas. There is a blessed safeguard in following the Christian year, and there are some excellent pages on the conspicuous moments of the Christian year and 'the organic coherence' of the Christian message in relation to it.

The chapter on the Sacraments is helpful. He will have nothing to do with the false contrast which makes the Catholic Church a sacramentarian Church and the Reformed Church a Church of the Word. Sacraments are central for both, and the profound difference lies in the interpretation of the meaning of both Gospel and sacrament. The message we have to herald is also a deed. Not all will go with him in all that he says of Baptism, and we would have welcomed a fuller treatment of the Lord's Supper than the one page devoted to it provides. The bishop clearly recognises that the Church has a task of Christian nurture, and that teaching is a necessary part of our function as heralds. He takes as his special example here the belief in eternal life and he assigns several illuminating pages to the conviction that faith in Christ and the assurance of eternal life are one and inseparable. The book ends, as it was bound to do, with the proclamation that the heralds of such a Gospel must go out into the whole world in the work of missions.

George S. Gunn

The Presence of the Kingdom. By Jacques Ellul. S.C.M. Press. 9s. 6d.

The burden of this book's message is that Christians must realise that they are the 'salt of the earth', and the 'light of the world', are sent 'forth as sheep in the midst of wolves' (p. 9), and are 'leaven' (p. 58). This is by no means a mere platitude, for the constant peril is that Christians should believe, no doubt rightly, that their mission is to be *in* the world yet *not of* the world, but wrongly conceive that all they can contrive to do is to select from the alternatives that the world supplies that one which seems best to accord with their faith. 'The world chooses its own methods, draws up its own plan of action in order to solve its problems; and people often think that if Christians are to help to preserve the world they ought to join in these movements' (p. 24).

This unpretentious book is so important that everyone should 'read, learn and inwardly digest' it, who is concerned with the message and task of the Church in and to our day and generation. It is one of those rewarding books which, one feels, breaks fresh ground, ventures where others no doubt have pointed but hardly dared to pioneer, and has the further merit of giving point to things that other people are saying and thinking.

'All that I have already written will be useless unless it is understood as a call to arms', says its author (p. 141); and it is impossible to think that any should read what he writes and fail to observe this challenging quality. The challenge is at once very penetrating and very simple. It is neither more nor less than that Christians should in the modern situation, with all its peculiar difficulties, really be Christians, and neither less nor other than Christians. This seems so obvious as to appear no more than an unproductive commonplace. Yet it is much more than this.

The writer holds, in opposition to this, that 'it is disastrous to see Christianity embarking in all the social and political boats of this world, entirely unaware of all the preliminary questions which they alone could examine' (p. 135). The motto text for the Christian life is 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you' (p. 95). 'It is not in doing exactly the same as other people, and in carrying out technical work, that the Christian "participates effectively" in the "preservation of the world", but in fulfilling his specific role' (p. 24). 'The channel through which the Gospel should reach the world—and does not—ought to be "layman" living the tension' (p. 19) 'that our life in this world is necessarily "scandalous" ' (p. 17). 'Here is the "point of contact" between the ideologies of the world in which he lives and theology' (p. 19).

The salient fact about the world we live in today is not, as so often alleged, that it is revolutionary. On the contrary, all the so-called revolutionaries of the modern world, the supporters of Socialism, like the National Socialists and Communists, are just as much 'conformists' as the conservatists of Capitalism and the like: they 'tend to pursue their course along the same line', and doing so become no more than 'conformists of the future', makers of blue-prints of a 'Hell organised upon earth for the bodily comfort of everybody' (p. 41). The real revolutionary is or ought to be, unless he lose this character by accommodation to and conformity with the world, the Christian. And this because, by his very commission, he is sent out as a kind of spy, 'to work in secret, at the heart of the world, for his Lord, to prepare for his Lord's victory from within' (p. 45). Christianity 'is revolutionary of necessity, and it cannot be otherwise, so far as Christ is acting in His Church' (p. 43).

What is it that chiefly impedes the man in the street, with even the best intentions, from acting as a genuine Christian? The answer given is the 'triumph of means' (p. 78), which has imposed as external disability upon living one's faith, in addition to the inherent and perennial inward disability of which St. Paul speaks, 'the good which I would I do not' (p. 77). This triumph refers to the supremacy of 'technics'. The writer points out that the implications of the triumph are the quiescent acceptance of 'facts', the arbitary limitation of facts to those discoverable by the means employed, the capricious selection of the facts in accordance with the means technics have discovered for their promulgation (press, radio, etc.), and the curious tyranny exercised by these means over the intellect as though outside and without them nothing were accessible to it. The final result is that the tension traditionally apparent between means and end is resolved by the simple but entirely erroneous method of obliterating the end altogether. We are today becoming better and better equipped to do we do not know what. 'Man has set out at tremendous speed—to go *nowhere*' (p. 69).

What is the task and duty of Christianity in this situation? It is triple. He has to exercise great sympathy with the man in the street, 'my neighbour Mario' (p. 119)—a phrase which has a classically lapidary quality; and it is ' "up to the Church" to see to it that (ordinary people) are not placed in such conditions that they cannot react otherwise than as "swine" to whom "pearls" have been thrown'. Second, the Christian has to restore to mankind the idea of the end. This is in fact simple, in the sense that it only means that the Christian has to live as a Christian, in the knowledge that there is indeed an end and in Christ it has been made apparent. Third, in compliance with the conditions of his commission and his life, he has to rehabilitate a characteristically Christian 'style of living'. This does not mean simply being 'in the fashion' or choosing 'the best commercial quality'. It does mean hammering out a new pattern of life on the basis of a rediscovery of our neighbour as a person, of the ultimate importance and significance of 'events', and of the borderline between the profane and the holy. 'It includes being faithful to one's wife as well as being accessible to one's neighbour. It includes the position one ought to take on current social and political questions, as well as the decision which relates to the personal employment of our time' (p. 148).

The book provides its own defence against the charge, which will no doubt be levelled against it, of being only one more evidence of that return to obscurantism with which Christianity in recent days has been attempting to carve out and fortify a place for itself in the modern sun. The defence is the affirmation of the reality of the distinction between the profane and the holy. 'To rediscover the limits of the Holy, to go as far as we can in the use of the intellect, but to stop willingly when we are in danger of invading the sphere of the Holy, this is one of the main functions of the intellectual search' (p. 133). But the limitation on the intellect is in fact no more than a limitation imposed upon it by an equipment of technical means it has itself devised. The inapplicability of these means to the sphere of the Holy leaves the intellect, divesting itself of them, entirely capable of appreciating what lies beyond the reach of the means that can in other directions accomplish so much.

If defect is to be mentioned, it must be the sweeping nature of the indictment of the whole situation in which the Christian life is lived today. With a French background, this is perhaps not very surprising. Nothing of what is said is untrue. Yet the situation, bad as it is, does not render quite everyone incapable of 'attaining reality' (p. 106). The author himself and his work is witness to the fact that there are yet some who have not bowed the knee to Baal. The reading of this work may associate with him others looking for such a penetrating critique of our situation, and at the same time fortify them in refusing to capitulate to the world, give them excellent grounds for doing so, and provide them with good reason for their instinctively Christian rebellion.

J. K. S. Reid

Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique. By Canon Eugène Masure. Desclée de Brouwer et C^ie^, Paris.

This little book is full of food for thought for those who are concerned about two of the crucial religious questions of our day, namely, the relevance to daily life of what Christians do in church, and the scandal of Christian division in face of an unbelieving world. It is Canon Masure's second essay on the nature and origins of the central act of Christian worship. His earlier book, *Le Sacrifice du Chef*, written in about 1932, has become known in this country in translation as *The Christian Sacrifice*, published by Burns, Oates and Washbourne in 1944. Masure's grand theme in both books is the Cross of Christ, the Head of all mankind as well as of the Church, as the only true sacrifice for sin, and the share that the Church which is His Body can have in it. The present book is a restatement of earlier views in the light of the encyclical *Mediator Dei* issued in

November, 1947. In *The Christian Sacrifice* one was surprised to find Masure criticising errors and crudities in Roman teaching about the mass and attributing them to post-Tridentine writers by name. But in *Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique* Masure declares that the encyclical has now recalled Christian piety from the by-path meadow of misunderstanding to the true and traditional road. Not that he considers the encyclical to be the last word; but he claims that it has given a new start to the discussion of the eucharist not only by Roman Catholics but by the whole Christian public, and he puts forward his book as a contribution to this. It of course bears the *imprimatur* of ecclesiastical authority.

The scheme of the book is simple. There are two main sections; the first discusses the eucharist as the efficacious sign of a mystery which is anterior to itself; the second examines the original intentions of Christ in the institution of the eucharist and its part in the life and gospel of the Apostolic church. On a fairly early page Masure expounds the scholastic trilogy of (1) *sacramentum-et-non-res*, the sacramental sign pure and simple, the rite separated, at least in thought, from the mystery it contains; (2) *sacramentum-et-res*, the objective reality united to its sign; and (3) *res-et-non-sacramentum*, the effects or spiritual fruits of the sacrament. Masure's thought is never far away from this triple formula; a large section of the book is devoted to the double meaning of *res*: the reality of the sacrifice of Christ within the sacramental sign (in 2) and the spiritual fruits of the sacrament (in 3).

Masure's first care is to point out what the sacramental sign *cannot* effect. Very soon he declares: there is one mystery and one only in the world, that of the Redemption. By accepting death as an offering to the Father, Christ became our eternal Mediator and the New Covenant itself in His own Person. The eucharist is far from detracting from the Cross; rather it pays homage to it. According to the true tradition, the service can modify nothing, innovate nothing, in the Body of Christ. Nevertheless Masure of course believes in the immolation of Christ in the sacrament (St. Augustine's word *Christus quotidie immolatur in sacramento* faces the title-page of *The Christian Sacrifice*) and in transubstantiation. How does he reconcile these beliefs with the Apostolic *kerygma* not of a rite but of a new covenant bought by Christ on the Cross?

Masure is not afraid to explain the ritual action of the mass by reference to what he calls the most ancient religious traditions of humanity. To immolate a victim is to present it to God, charged with our devotion, and to make it over entirely to Him so that it may return to us laden with the blessing of divine acceptance. At its lowest, this upward and downward movement of sacrifice is commerce with the deity, an attempt to win over a capricious Being to our own purposes. At its highest sacrifice is offered and accepted as the alliance between an unchangeable God and His covenanted yet wayward people. Now the good news of which the New Testament is full is that the death of Christ has fulfilled these ancient religious aspirations. It was, says Masure, the declaration that the judicial murder of a just man, even though he were the Son of God, could be an effective sacrifice that aroused the fury of the Jews and the incredulity of the Greeks and struck dismay to the hearts of the Apostles when they first heard it from Christ's lips.

But if Christ's death is the one and unrepeatable sacrifice of the true covenant between God and man, Christ also gave us a ritual sign of it which can be repeated every day. This was not so much a new rite as a new content for an old one. Masure accepts the view that the blessing of the bread before supper and of the cup after supper were an established custom which Christ had often observed with His friends and which they would repeat at countless meals after His departure. Into this simple ceremony Christ poured the whole content of His coming sacrificial death. As often as the Apostles did this, they would recall their Master, and He would be among them, in just that disposition, so vividly portrayed by the Fourth Gospel in the high-priestly prayer, which led Him to the Cross. Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more, but His successive states of humiliation and glorification are immanent in each other; He *is* the Lamb as slain from the foundation of the world. To say, then, that Christ is immolated in the sacrament means, Masure assures us, that as often as the Church takes the cup of salvation she has the presence of Christ in His state of immolated and accepted victim of the new covenant. The New Testament writers emphasise what was unbelievable news to their hearers and themselves, that Jesus is the Lamb who has redeemed us to God by His death and now lives for ever to intercede for us; it would seem natural to those who first heard the Gospel that Christianity, like other religions, should have the power to make its inmost mystery present to believers here and now under a sensible sign. Our difficulty is the opposite one: we accept an incredible Gospel because it is familiar, but the idea that the heart of religion can be embodied in a sacramental sign is strange and we doubt whether Christ can have so intended.

The content of the eucharist can only be what Christ intended; Masure allows no ambiguity about that. The belief that transubstantiation proceeds inevitably from the words of the institution runs through both books, and a reviewer cannot hope to do justice in a few sentences to Masure's thought on a matter which is at once so technical and so controversial. It is common ground that in the eucharist we set aside bread, by which God strengthens us for work, and wine, with which He gladdens our hearts, from their common use and offer them to God as the token of our devotion to Him in the dealings of daily life. Such a service is not dissimilar to the ceremonial thanksgiving over the bread and the cup anciently practised by devout Jews. The question is, what difference has Christ made to it? Is the Church's offering made '*in response to* the perfect Offering once made and once for all' (as a recent publication by the Iona Community declares), or can we go further and say that our offering is *taken up into* Christ's offering of Himself and is accepted by God not as charged with our poor devotion, but as bearing the sacrifice of Christ under the sign that He appointed, in fact that it becomes, by God's acceptance, the Body of Christ? Here, Masure recognises, is the crux of the divisions of western Christendom. In what sense, he asks, if at all, can we collaborate in the work of redemption and what did St. Paul mean by supplying what was lacking in Christ's sufferings? These questions also lie at the heart of the problem of the relevance of worship to daily life.

As we have already noticed Masure sees a double efficacy (*res*) in the sacrament, namely, the real presence of Christ and its spiritual fruits. He emphasises characteristically that the grace of the sacrament is that which proceeds from a sacrifice: it is not such as might be gained by any other religious exercise. The purpose of all acts of Christian devotion, doubtless, is union with Christ, but the eucharist unites us with Christ in His self-offering to the Father as Priest and Victim for all mankind. Its peculiar relevance to human need is that it uses a sensible sign to bring us under the banner of Christ, *le grand religieux du Père*, into the inmost mysteries of the Godhead. Some may well say (they said it to the authors of the English prayer-book in 1552 and are saying it to the Church of South India today) that frail man cannot come to God with any offering. Masure, I think, would respect this view; but his reply is that the chief spiritual effect of the sacrament is the effort of offering something which Christ will overwhelm with His own riches, and that the final proof of God's love is not even that He gave His Son but that His unbelievable condescension deigns to receive His Son's sacrifice from our hands.

Christ-God-mankind. Masure's canvas is vast, but there is Another, who is hardly mentioned. It is not Masure, but the neglect of generations, that has failed to study the part of the Holy Spirit in the redemption of the world. Yet it was through the Spirit that Jesus offered Himself a sacrifice for sin, and it was Pentecost that showered the fruits of God's acceptance upon the Church. In other words the double movement of Christ's sacrifice, to God in immolation and from God in blessing, is a movement of the Holy Spirit; and so too in its turn must be the Godward and manward movement of the eucharist. The Spirit is among us, whether we acknowledge Him with true understanding or not. But we may not be able to agree on the meaning and relevance of Christian worship until our teaching about the Holy Spirit has been developed to balance the vast amount of thought that has been expended on the visible aspects of the Christian religion.

Ronald E. C. Johnson

Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. By Norval Geldenhuys. Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 685 pp. 25s.

Here is a commentary in which careful scholarship, practical sagacity and spiritual insight are notably combined. The author, a former scholar of Princeton, Cambridge and Pretoria, is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa; and to the making of this book the urgent concerns of the preacher and the pastor have contributed, no less than the interests of the theologian and the wide reading of the careful research student. This is indeed all to the good. Too many commentaries fail in the one direction or the other: either pursuing devotional and homiletical values without waiting for patient and accurate exegesis, or else concentrating so exclusively on details of interpretation and points of academic interest that it becomes impossible to see the wood for the trees. Some there are, however—one thinks of notable instances like George Adam Smith's *Isaiah*, Denney's 2 *Corinthians* and *Thessalonians*, Lohmeyer's *Mark*—which preserve a due balance; and when a work of this kind appears, it is a treasure indeed. For this reason this new study of the Gospel of Luke by Mr Geldenhuys deserves a warm welcome. The accurate scholarship, the evidences of wide reading, the will to grapple with problems of text and meaning—these things, though never obtruded, are there on every page; but at the same time one is never allowed to forget the essential character of the Gospel as *kerygma*, a proclamation bearing upon life at every point. A brief but adequate Introduction on questions of authorship, sources, language and the like is followed by the main body of the commentary; and here the discussion of each passage in the text is subdivided into two sections, the first expounding the contents and the meaning of the passage, and the second dealing with special points, linguistic, textual and historical. It may be that the active life of a busy pastorate is the best background from which to interpret a missionary document like the Gospel of St. Luke.

Certainly this is the kind of book which those who week by week expound the Scriptures in the ministry of preaching, and leaders of Bible Classes and discussion groups, will find particularly suggestive and rewarding.

James S. Stewart

The Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume. Studies in Jewish Theology by A. Marmorstein, Ph.D., edited by J. Rabbinowitz, Ph.D., and M. S. Lew, Ph.D. Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, 1950. Price 30s.

These studies, ten in number, are a selection of articles contributed by the author to various theological journals. In the introduction to the volume a list of the works of Marmorstein ranging from 1904 to 1948 exhibits the tireless industry which this scholar displayed in his researches into Jewish literature and its religious thought and will prove of very great interest to the student in this field. The articles which the editors have chosen for this memorial volume for the most part concentrate upon the Jewish Haggadic writings and the light which these throw upon the theology of Judaism. Christians, when in dispute with Jews, have at times been warned against drawing upon Haggadah to illustrate the content of Jewish religious beliefs, on the ground that Haggadah is of sermonic rather than of a doctrinal character and implicates rather the individual writer than the views of the community. But in these studies Dr Marmorstein shows the importance of Haggadah as a vehicle of Jewish theology and polemic.

In the chapter on 'The Background of the Haggadah', the author reveals the wide influence which the teachings of Marcion acquired, particularly in Eastern regions, and the place which Haggadic writings occupied in refuting Marcionite and Gnostic thought. In the essay on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead we are shown how this kind of literature provided the rabbis with a defence of the doctrine against the adverse popular criticism which was brought against it. So also in regard to that cardinal article of belief, namely the unity of God, Haggadah offered a very adequate protection to Judaism from its religious opponents and detractors.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in this volume is that on 'Judaism and Christianity in the Middle of the Third Century' with its religious-historical study of a certain sect which flourished at this time. This sect, mentioned in rabbinic writings under the title 'transgressors of Israel' (*posh'e Israel*), received from orthodox Jewish teachers both praise and blame, and seems to have retained what in the eyes of Jews were laudable characteristics of Jewish religion and life, while yet it stood in other respects with one foot outside the Israelite camp. Dr Marmorstein finds the key to the problem of the identity of this sect in the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions* and pronounces it to be that body of Judaeo-Christians who in the Clementines reconciled Mosaism and Christianity and who held Moses and Jesus to be the only true prophets. The author pays special tribute to Professor Karl Schmidt's book. *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XLVI.1 (Leipzig, 1930) for the light it sheds on this interesting sect—and cites Schmidt as saying that in the whole of the ecclesiastical literature there is nothing comparable to the contention of these Jewish Christians that Mosaism and the Christian faith were of equal worth.

O. S. RANKIN

An Experiment in Worship. By IAN THOMSON. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

THIS booklet describes the course and also the historical and theological justification of a 'serious attempt to break a deadlock that has long existed between separated Churches' (p. 7), by means of a 'revival of the Agape', undertaken jointly by an Anglican and a Methodist Church. It is explained that 'in its bare essentials the Agape is simply a breaking of bread and a sharing of the broken bread with prayers' (p. 18). Those responsible for the experiment not only appreciated the difference between the Agape and the Holy Communion, but clearly proclaimed it, lest there should be among those taking part any kind of misunderstanding. A brief list of the obvious differences is supplied (p. 41); but much more satisfying evidence of the realisation of the issues involved is to be found elsewhere in the text. 'The most interesting feature of all this symbolism is that it emphasises the horizontal unity, so to speak, which should be a bond among all Christians. The effect is wholly distinct from that of the reception of the sacrament which is essentially an act of "Communion with the Lord", and is therefore, as it were, vertical' (p. 37).

With what kind of thing are we here dealing? Everyone knows that there are dominical sacraments, rites 'commonly called sacraments', and occasions and things which of the will of God may become 'means of grace'. One is tempted to wonder what the place and status of this *quartum quid* among the 'sacramentals' is likely to be. Manifest differences distinguish it from the three types named; it is more difficult to define in what its essence consists.

But putting this theoretical question on one side, it is clear that we have here a resolute practical attempt to by-pass the tremendous obstacles standing in the way of those who believe that intercommunion is a desirable goal. This practice is something that brings the divided communions of Christ's Church together into a common action, and increase of fellowship and love between them is the likely result. The importance of this Agape and its revived practice may in the last resort be found to rest less in the external resemblance it bears to the Holy Communion, than in the discharge of this humbler task of simply promoting good relationships between the Churches.

J. K. S. Reid

The Living Interest of the Old Testament. By R. B. Y. Scott. McGill University.

The Rev. R. B. Y. Scott, Professor of OT Language and Literature in McGill University, took as the subject of an inaugural lecture, 'The Living Interest of the Old Testament'. He begins by enumerating some of the causes of the modern prejudices against the OT, remarking that second century Marcionism is very much alive in some quarters today, and then goes on to show how ill-founded such an attitude towards the OT is. He then proceeds to demonstrate the relevance of the OT for the human situation today.

Professor Scott sets forth the more important relevant archeological discoveries and the contribution they have made towards a better understanding of the OT. The living interest of the OT from the point of view of the preacher is to be found chiefly in these moments of crisis when God judges human sin and arrogancy; and also in the divine act of choosing Israel to be the trustee of faith in God and of knowledge of Himself.

This pamphlet should be put into the hands of as many young people as possible; it possesses special value for leaders of Bible Classes and Youth Fellowships.

J. G. S. S. Thomson

The Beginning of the Gospel. By T. W. Manson.
The Furtherance of the Gospel. By R. W. Moore.
The Truth of the Gospel. By G. B. Caird.
Science, History and Faith. By Alan Richardson.
All Oxford University Press, at 6s. 6d. each.

The first three of these volumes form a short series of Primers of Christianity. In *The Beginning of the Gospel* Dr Manson gives us first a short introduction in which, with masterly skill, he outlines the growth of the Jewish Messianic idea, shows how Jesus fulfilled and modified that idea and finally indicates the place of the Church in Christianity. Thereafter Dr Manson goes on to give us a new translation of St. Mark's Gospel followed by certain selected New Testament passages.

Dr Manson's book will be of infinite value for the student who has some knowledge; but as a first introduction it is inevitably too compressed. It is a considerable achievement to compress a statement of the synoptic problem into thirty lines of print. It may well be, however, that the very virtue of such a treatment is that it whets the appetite for more.

The second volume, *The Furtherance of the Gospel*, describes in 159 pages the spread of the Gospel and the extension of Christianity, from about A.D. 30 to the present day. There is no better short vivid account of the great movements of Church History than this book. This is a Primer in the true sense of the word.

In the third volume Dr Caird discusses the question, Is the gospel true today? In many ways this is a most excellent book. But it has its faults. Its gravest fault is that Dr Caird argues far too often and far too much by analogy and analogies have an ugly habit of descending disastrously on the head of him who uses them.

If this book strays into unwisdom at times it is the unwisdom of sheer enthusiasm which is often better than the careful correctness of pedantry.

The fourth volume is not actually one of the series but it is closely connected with the other three. Its aim is to show those who are willing to study and to think, those who have already read the Primers, that there is such a thing as a real science of theology. It goes on certain assumptions which we take leave to criticise. It uses a well-worn argument. Dr Richardson argues that in any science, he takes geometry as an instance, we assume that we can get practically nowhere without studying the works of the masters and so argues that without studying the works of the masters of the religious and the devotional life we cannot really reach the heights of the religious life, or at least we have no right to deliver verdicts on theological things. It is an often used argument and yet there is a glaring fallacy in it. It is of no great importance whether or not a man knows geometry; he need not know it unless he likes; but *every* man *must* form some view of God and the world or life is not only incomplete but intolerable; that is to say geometry in the end matters to the few; religion to all. And just because of that it is a personal discovery which any man not only can but must make.

The Christian Church after all was founded on the first man who discovered who Jesus was. This is not to belittle the part of the Church in the salvation of men but it is to plead for the restatement of the fact that it is as an individual that a man meets Christ, and it is from that meeting that theology must start.

Again we have taken from this volume the things with which we cannot agree; but again we would say that no one can read it without being compelled to think and to think deeply. Nothing but good could come from putting this volume into the hands of those for whom it was written.

The volumes are all beautifully printed and excellently indexed. The first three have useful bibliographies for further study. In Dr Manson's volume, the quotation marks of the last sentence on page 2 have not been closed.

William Barclay

Full Communion with the Church of England. A Methodist appeals to Methodists. By John Lawson, M.A., B.D., B.Sc. Epworth Press, 1951. 31 pp. 1s. 6d.

This short pamphlet contains, in a well condensed form, the arguments concerning reunion with the Church of England as affecting English Methodists. The writer's main thesis is that both the 'Churchly' (or as others would say, 'Catholic') tradition of the Church of England and the 'Evangelical' tradition of the Methodists require each other and should never have been separated. To an Anglican his approach to the whole problem seems right. The special value of the pamphlet is its firm grasp of practical difficulties combined with the possession of true perspective and right principles.

Norman J. Cockburn

Positive Protestantism. By Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., Ph.D. The Westminster Press. $2.50.

This is a stimulating little book from the pen of the Professor of Systematic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. The author has already put many under an obligation who have made use of his *Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion* and his *Compend of Luther's Theology*, the latter being a specially daring venture in view of the voluminous works summarised. The present volume has another purpose. The thesis is suggested by Philip Schaff's fine phrase, that 'Protestantism was an even deeper plunge into the meaning of the Gospel than ever St. Augustine had made'; and the plea made is that Protestantism, if the future is to belong to it, must recover this firmer hold upon the Gospel in which its origin consisted. 'It is the great strength of Protestantism that it can think of itself as subject to the call of repentance.' It 'has a destiny to act as the evangelical conscience of Christendom, recalling itself and all other forms of the Christian faith back to the gospel of God in Christ'. Such a 'Church is simply Christ living in His people'. Retaining its living personal relation with its Head, the Church need neither fall foul of the dead institutionalism of Romanism, nor suffer the damaging hoar frost, as Brunner calls it, that settled down upon the Protestant movement and encumbered it with a new scholasticism.

J. K. S. Reid

The First Epistle of Peter. By C. E. B. Cranfield. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The Fourth Gospel and its Message for Today. By W. H. Rigg, D.D. . Lutterworth Press. 15s.

The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By R. V. G. Tasker, B.D. Tyndale Press. 2s. 6d.

The first book is a short but pointed running commentary on the English text of the Epistle, which combines exposition of the language with practical application of the matters to the problems of the present day. It is informed by all the carefree and even meticulous scholarship which we have learned to expect from the author, who contrives, though writing for readers without a knowledge of Greek, to bring out at every point the strict philological values of the terms employed. An excellent example is the careful exposition of the difficult passage III.17-IV. I, where Mr Cranfield rightly rejects the ingenious but quite improbable conjecture of Rendel Harris which makes 'Enoch' the subject of the *descensus ad inferos* referred to in III.19. The apostle affirms a visit of the Saviour to the underworld, 'the spirits in prison' being the generation of mankind that perished in the Flood. The proclamation of the Christ to these most notorious of sinners is considered as taking place after His death—presumably in the interval preceding the resurrection. The difficult word about baptism in III.20-21 is explained, with Dr Selwyn, as meaning: 'And water now saves you too, who are the antitype of Noah and his company, namely the water of baptism.' *Eperotema* again is, on the strength of some evidence for the word in the papyri, interpreted to mean 'a pledge of good conscience towards God, i.e. baptism is or pledge . . . of God's forgiveness of sins'. Wisely, however, Mr Cranfield will not regard the meaning of this passage as undoubtedly settled. The student of First Peter—which is ascribed *via* Silvanus to the Apostle—will find in this little book a most competent and helpful guide.

The second volume is not a verse by verse commentary on St. John's Gospel but a general exposition of its great governing conceptions—the Glory of God, Eternal Life, Sin and Atonement, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Sacraments. Its purpose is to present the substance of the Gospel from the standpoint of the relation in which these cardinal realities stand to the intellectual and spiritual needs of the world in which we live—man's quest of light, life and peace. How deeply Archdeacon Rigg has pondered the relation of the Gospel to the spiritual guests of the coeval Hellenistic-Oriental world is apparent from the opening chapter on the Gospel as 'A Tract for the Times'. The themes which are handled—mystery, religion, the longing for assurances of immortality, the conception of saviour gods, the logos idea in its religious aspect—reveal the original setting of the Ephesian Gospel. St. John will supply 'the Christian counterpart to the Deikvuusva the Oriental Mysteries'. Dr Rigg would go further and contend that 'More than any other writer of the New Testament the Evangelist was sensitive to the idea prevalent in the non-Christian circles of his day, thereby illustrating the truth that the Church must not only be a teaching Church but a learning Church'. All this, though not unfamiliar, is excellently defended and illumined by broad and varied learning and by the completest willingness on the author's part to take a realistic view of the relation between Gospel and environment, so far as the environment is concerned. But whether Dr Rigg is as realistic in his evaluation of the specific Christian concepts of the Gospel in relation, say, to the terms of the Synoptic or the Pauline teachings, is less apparent. It may be thought that the acceptance by Dr Rigg of the apostolic authorship of the Gospel has to some degree softened the impact of this question. While, therefore, his chapters on the great themes of the book offer a valuable and gracious exposition of the Johannine theology in itself, they come short of a satisfying explanation of the historical differences revealed by comparison of the Johannine with the Synoptic records. It is possible to build too much on the reminiscences of an eye-witness, and, identifying the eye-witness with the Apostle, to assume too readily that the psychology of old age, or the softening and mellowing force of time, or an old man's fondness for first principles supplies the explanation of this or that difference. While it would be perverse to rule out *a priori* the operation of all such factors, it is unwise to make too much of them, and it may be doubted whether they touch the essential features of the Johannine representation. The Fourth Gospel remains more of a mystery than Dr Rigg is perhaps willing to allow, but so far as the intrinsic content of that representation is concerned, his exposition takes honourable rank in the literature of the subject.

Mr Tasker's work incorporates a short series of lectures delivered by Professor Tasker during the Vacation Term for Biblical study at Cambridge in 1949. The general subject of the course, to which these studies were contributed, was 'The Divine Plan of Redemption', and the method of approach adopted is popular and non-technical. The author sub-divides his matters under the four heads: Preparation, Fulfilment, Consequences, Appeal. 'Preparation' surveys the Divine purpose in the education of Israel down to the coming of Jesus Christ; the start is made from Hebrews 1.1, and the chapter follows the course of OT religious history epitomised in Hebrews 11. 'Fulfilment arrests the fundamental nature of the salvation offered in the gospel and warns against the danger of Christians losing grasp of its existential implications.' 'Consequences' is concerned with Christianity and the Church as marking the emergence in time of the predicted 'New Age' or New Creation; and the final chapters on the 'Appeal' of the Epistle deals with exhortations to Christian steadfastness and loyalty on the part of the community to which the Epistle was written. It may be thought that the arrangement of the material adopted for the purpose of popular expositions has too little in common with the special historical purpose of the Epistle to bring its dominating message to sharp definition. The purpose is not merely, or primarily, to instruct the readers in Christian knowledge but to arouse them to brave and resolute Christian action in the light of a recovered sense of their eschatological calling. The readers are exhorted to resume that original calling, to press forward to perfection, to go out to Jesus 'beyond the camp'. It may be felt that this essentially eschatological message of the Epistle has not received adequate recognition in the otherwise admirable digest of the teaching which Mr Tasker has provided.

W. Manson

THE COMMAND OF GOD THE CREATOR

AN ACCOUNT OF KARL BARTH'S VOLUME ON ETHICS[1]

by THE REV. W. A. WHITEHOUSE

THIS twelfth chapter of the *Dogmatik* is an exposition of the ethical teaching which follows upon an understanding of the doctrine of creation. Further chapters on ethics will come at the end of the volumes on reconciliation and redemption and Barth notes that the whole complex of state, community and law must wait for more thorough treatment until the next volume is completed. Here we have a generous and moving exposition of man's freedom in relation to God; his freedom in the community of male and female, parent and child, near and distant neighbours; his freedom for life with due evaluation of reverence for life, its protection and its industriousness; and his freedom within appointed limits where opportunities do not recur, where each person has his 'station' and must live with the honour appropriate to his limitations. The exposition follows the formal lines worked out in the volume on man. It is studded with careful reviews of the more important recent books dealing with the themes under discussion. In this field Barth shows the greatest respect for Schleiermacher who of course worked out his theology with a profound sense of the richness and complexity of human life, though here, as well as in his grasp on the Gospel, Barth's understanding seems to be both richer and more sensitive. The distinctive feature of the work is its firm adherence to the conviction that ethics, as the doctrine of God's command, exhibits the law as a form of the Gospel, grounded everywhere in the knowledge of Jesus Christ and of God's gracious election of man to covenant fellowship with Himself in Christ. Grace and freedom are therefore the fundamental categories, even in respect of those moments in the divine command which are appropriately examined in the light of the Creator's 'ordinances'. Brunner's *Divine Imperative* receives sustained criticism throughout the volume on the ground that its approach is ultimately 'legalist' and therefore fails to exhibit the true character and full range of God's command.

---

[1] Karl Barth, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik* Band III/4: *Die Lehre von der Schöpfung*, 4te Teil. Evangelischer Verlag A.G. Zollikon-Zürich, 810 pp. 1951; 37 Swiss fr.; with paper covers 33.50.

Barth's general discussion of God's command and the problem of ethics may be found in *Dogmatik* II/2, a summary of which was made by the late Dr Camfield in *Reformation Old and New*, c.V. The question raised by general ethics concerns the ground and possibility of the fact that 'in the multiplicity of human actions and modes of action, there arise certain constancies, laws, rules, customs and continuities'. Their rightfulness, suitability and worth are brought under question. Theological ethics tries to grasp the fact that human conduct is good insofar as it is *hallowed* by God's Word, which is the content, measure and origin of such hallowing. It shows how God's command comes to men as a permission, a sovereign, concrete and gracious decision, and as God's judgment by which they are at once condemned and forgiven. It indicates whence and how *rightness* is bestowed on actions and courses of action wherein men find themselves engaged in the rough and tumble of life. In this volume Barth passes from general ethics to special ethics and asks what it means, in the context of Creator and creature, that man is under God's command, that here he is hallowed by that command and has freedom *vis-à-vis* the will of God and thereby freedom for eternal life. In substance, his answer is to indicate with precision the regions of life which call for special attention in this context and to work out the criteria of obedience to God's command.

It will be impossible to give a proper summary of this tremendous account of human conduct, or even to mention half the points where, if Barth is right, the Church needs to re-think its ethical pronouncements. I must be content to translate the five main theses, to discuss the method by which Barth conducts this inquiry, to indicate the broad outlines of his exposition, providing first by way of sample the content of one small section.

52. *Ethics as a task within the doctrine of creation*

The task of special ethics, within the doctrine of creation, is to inform men both of the fact, and of the extent to which, the one command of the one God who is gracious to man in Jesus Christ is also the command of man's Creator, and is therefore the present hallowing of man's creaturely action and of his refraining from action.

53. *Freedom before God*

God the Creator wills that man, as His creature, should account for himself in His presence. His command says in particular that he shall[1] keep His day holy, as a day of celebration, freedom and joy; that with heart and mouth he shall acknowledge (*bekennen*) Him; and that he shall come to Him as a suppliant.

54. *Freedom in association*

In that the Creator calls man to Himself, He also turns him towards his fellow-man. God's command says in particular that in the encounter of man and woman, in the relation between parents and children, and on the path from those who are near to those who are distant, man shall affirm the other person in affirming himself and affirm himself in affirming the other person, that he shall hold him in respect and gladden him.

55. *Freedom to live*

In that God the Creator calls man to Himself and turns him towards his fellow-man, He tells him to honour his own life and that of each other man and to defend it against all caprice in order to make it effective in His service and in preparation for His service.

56. *Freedom within circumscribed limits*

God the Creator wills for man and lays claim to man (who belongs to Him, is bound up with his fellow-man, and is summoned to affirm his own life and the life of others) within the special purpose which is indicated by the time-limits, the vocation and the dignity which, as his Creator and Lord, He has marked out for him.

Only 50 pages out of 800 are devoted to considerations of method. The rest of the book is positive exposition. In view of the prevailing confusion about method in theological ethics, however, and in view of the widespread opinion that Barth (despite what was said in II/2) can only deal with ethics in terms of a point-to-point inspiration theory, it may be helpful to consider this first section with some care.

The task of 'special ethics' is often discharged by casuistry, the exposition of an amalgum of Biblical texts, 'natural law' and western tradition with reference to 'cases of conscience'. This is deemed to bring to light God's 'law' as a formal command which is applied to cases in an appropriate way by interpretation. It rests upon a misreading of man's existence under the command of God. In place of the concrete divine command which is revealed in the ethical experience, it sets up the opinion of the moralist; it violates human freedom by subjecting man to law rather than to grace; and it leaves men bereft of the full and certain knowledge of the concrete divine command which comes from the living God and requires no interpretation. How, then, should we raise the question about God's command in respect of concrete acts of human will, decision, conduct and forbearance?

---

[1] The verb is *dürfen*, not *sollen*. It indicates a summons to man to take advantage of a freedom to which he is given access by the grace of God.

All ethical occasions are moments in the encounter of God with men, where His command, which comes 'vertically from above', is addressed to men living also within 'horizontal' relationships. There is unity and constancy in the divine command, for all ethical occasions are moments in the *Heilsgeschichte*, and there is a corresponding stability and continuity in the horizontal realm. The problem is to work out an account of this 'horizontal' which will afford an indication of the character of ethical experiences and serve as instructive preparation for them, which is what Brunner has done with his 'ordinances' and Bonhoeffer with his 'mandates'. These impositions of authority are relationships to be fulfilled wherever God commands. The analysis of them offered by Brunner and by Bonhoeffer (in his posthumous *Ethik*) is precarious and, in Brunner's case, inadequate to the Gospel of God's grace and man's freedom. He claims to find, by scrutiny of 'reality', certain ordinances of creation. But this 'reality', our 'field of action' which has to be expounded in special ethics, is known only as we participate by faith in the meeting of God with man in the person of Jesus Christ. It is God the Holy Trinity, encountering man the creature made to be His covenant-partner, man the sinner to whom in grace God remains true, man the child of God who already enjoys the certainty of expected sonship in an eternal future, who enter together into every ethical experience. The field of action disclosed in each such experience, in its integrity, complexity and differentiation, is not known *a priori*, nor is it known by postulating a self-contained economy of the first article of the Creed and finding laws peculiar to a Creator according to which God's command is given, which is how the 'ordinances of creation' are usually conceived.

Special ethics is therefore a commentary on the meeting of God with man in the concreteness of *Heilsgeschichte* and its orderly differentiations will post-scribe what is pre-scribed in the Word of God. And here we can say that the command of the God who is gracious to us in Jesus Christ is also the command of man's *Creator* and is the hallowing of *creaturely* action and forbearance. Here Barth's method rests on the conviction that the election of Jesus Christ and of man in Him is the inner ground of creation. Creation's meaning is to be found in the grace which forgives sin and awakens man to life from death. Jesus Christ is the *Realgrund*, not merely the *Erkenntnisgrund* of creation. Thus the Creator's command is given, not in and through an obscure 'world-reality', but in a reality of grace, which establishes a province where God is man's friend and benefactor in quite precise ways, and man may be God's friend and the recipient of His benefit. Instead of 'orders' or 'ordinances' it is better to speak of 'provinces' (*Bereich*) in the being and action of God and in the being and conduct of man where God knows man with a Creator's knowledge, and where man's liberation and hallowing by God's command can be grasped only by commentary clearly based on the doctrine of creation.

In this volume, therefore, Barth is concerned to open up for us the horizontal field of action where men live under the command of God; to prepare us to hear that command insofar as it conveys to us the will of our Creator; to help us to understand it as a command which aims always at human freedom and exaltation; and to suggest the right questions which we must be prepared to face in particular moments of ethical experience. He follows the lines laid down in III/2 where he worked out the theology of man as the creature of God, and asks first about the freedom proposed by the will of the commanding God in the relationship of man to God Himself; then about the freedom which God desires for man in his relationship to his fellow-men; then about the freedom which man is to achieve in the act of living as soul of his body; finally about the freedom which man is to achieve precisely as a limited and circumscribed entity. These are the features of man, the responsible creature of God. The command of God is always the command to fulfil this responsibility and thus to live before God as one free for Him.

Barth's method is thus the same in regard to the exposition of ethics as he adopts for all other areas of dogmatic theology. It rests on the same epistemology and the same submission to the Word of God in its Scriptural attestation. It is best exhibited in practice, but in this volume, with its wealth of concrete particularity, a brief exhibition is peculiarly difficult and unsatisfying and we must be content to catalogue a few of the results.

II

The section on freedom before God lends itself to rather fuller exposition than do the others. It is interesting that Barth repudiates the notion that there are no acts of love to God which are not in the form of love for one's neighbour, and that he sets such store by a non-profane area of conduct. In its detail, his inquiry goes concretely to the heart of our inadequacies with tremendous stimulus. When it is translated I foresee that its theological power will be hailed in this country as robust generous Christian common sense, but it will bear rich fruit in transformed sermons and conduct. But the outline I propose to offer seems dreadfully bald and abstract. Three matters come under consideration: observance of the Lord's Day, confession of faith, and prayer.

The Lord's Day is marked by celebration, freedom and joy. It is a time specially claimed by God because He claims the whole of our time, and He requires in response to this claim, not merely an attitude to all our time, but deliberate concrete deeds arising from a resolution of mind and conduct. Unless we obey His command in its speciality, our whole obedience falls short of that *actualised* hallowing which Sabbath observance promised in Exodus 31.12-17 or Ezekiel 20.12 and 20. Its two notes, freedom from work and freedom for God, make it a radical demonstration that human life is ultimately a 'resting in God'. But either note, taken by itself, produces the imposition of new burdens which turn each Sunday into a *wasted* day of rest. The mandatory permission of God is that on His day man shall express joyful faith in Him and turn his back on all self-propagated willing or achieving. The theology of its celebration does not depend on religious or humanitarian grounds which appear in contexts other than this creaturely 'resting in

God', and Barth suggests its outline by raising four groups of questions, all of which bring the Sabbatarianisms of the onetime ruling classes under searching criticism. To approach Sunday with a programme is a dubious way of treating it as a day when our life is peculiarly acknowledged to be in God's hands. Should it not be open for the programme He suggests when we meet Him in His house? To celebrate it as a joyous feast presupposes the effective driving away of our cares, which only God can do. Does the Church, in its ordering of worship expect this from God? Does its worship leave us free to spend a good Sunday once we have left its portals? It is the Lord's Day of rest for His *people*, a social occasion which means more than spending it *en famille* or with old friends. Is the Church able to initiate a wider sociality, beginning from its own congregational life? Finally, it is the first day of a new week of work and domestic life. Do we learn more about its celebration next time when each Monday morning tests whether or not we have spent it well?

Confession of faith must also be considered under the aspect of a particular action with its appointed time, as witness the moments when men in the OT 'worshipped God'. It is active participation by a human spokesman in the *Heilsgeschichte*, whereby the name of the Lord is invoked and hallowed with precise historical consequences. Barth points out first that it is free invocation of God, a dancing before the ark of the covenant done purely for His honour, and it is spoilt by any calculation of effect. Secondly, however, the given opportunity for it is one for entering a protest against unbelief, doubt or heresy. To regard its normal context as a festal or liturgical one is to insulate the act against the suffering and conflict which it properly entails. But God, when He requires this action, is seeking pacification for His world, not the guilt-laden martyrdom of His witnesses, and therefore they should not resort to confession as a kind of police reaction to unbelief. Nor should they forget that it is meant to provide a light in darkness, a purpose seldom achieved by pious musing or lyrical gushing. Thirdly, though privately held convictions may give to an act of confession the incisive relevance which is proper to it, the act should never be that of a soloist nor even of a chamber-music player. It is the community's witness to its Lord (required of

Peter and thrice withheld by him) which has to be echoed; the witness to which the congregation is brought where the whole Bible is newly opened to them. And it should be echoed in the form of concrete truth from Scripture, not in the vague form of 'Biblical truths'. Fourthly, the freedom within which the act is permitted includes freedom in the choice of language, and freedom from anxiety about its performance. To invoke God and to confess faith with an air of pedantry, or with an air of heroism, is to fall away from these freedoms, as Barth fears Melanchthon did by not really taking to heart the verse (Psalm 119.46) which stands at the head of the Augsburg Confession!

Prayer, the perennial undertone of all action, is related to confession as breathing in is related to breathing out. But it is required as a deliberate act; a motion of formal speech where the lips as well as the heart are engaged. It is the chief concrete act by which the festivity of the Lord's Day is carried into every day. Barth offers some criteria of proper prayer. First, it is man's freedom before God (the fact that he *may* pray) which is the ground of obligation. The arguments and impediments in the way of obedience only disappear where the act is seen to be grounded in the covenant relationship where it is strictly a matter of command, dealing with the constant threat to which our solidarity with Christ is exposed. 'I can't pray' turns out in fact to mean 'I won't pray; I won't submit to the judgment of God and live by His grace'. Secondly, to safeguard the facts that man comes before God solely as a receptive vessel and that in His presence all masks must be dropped, the primary and decisive form of prayer is petition. Other moments come to expression, not in and for themselves, but in and with petition, to safeguard its holiness and purity. Thirdly, the petition is offered by one whose cause God has made His own in the manhood of Jesus Christ. Petition is made representatively on behalf of the universal subject of God's grace (mankind) by the particular subject (the Church). It is a prayer that since God has made our interest His, then His interest may become ours. Fourthly, prayer is made with the certainty of being heard; i.e. 'in faith, not doubting'. To pray, not with an eye on our ability to do it nicely, but with a conviction that what we ask will affect the detail of God's providential rule, makes a world of difference. Finally, since our engagement in prayer is an obedience which is also freedom, the form of that engagement calls for scrutiny and resolution. Here private and corporate prayer may be taken together. Prayer begins and ends with *asking*. The asking must have a disciplined courtesy. It is done by silent or open speech, and the offering of silent prayer *by a congregation* raises questions for a mind as clear, though generous, as that of Barth. It is a matter of formulated speech, because we ought to pray even when we don't 'feel like it'. The formulations will in principle be short, since requests are soon made. Whatever habits and set times be resolved upon, we hope always to get beyond the mechanism into glad and free and willing prayer. To achieve this in public worship, however, raises questions about the preparation for public prayer, by minister and congregation, which Barth discusses with realistic concern.

From these pages there emerges a vivid picture of modern man, and of the commanding grace which is summoning him to live as God's good creature in this first realm of deliberate relationship with his Maker. Those who would challenge its veracity, from Scripture, from historical theology, or from the sensitive appraisal of human experience, must reckon with a wealth of material which Barth has explicitly taken into account. I think it will hold its ground, not, let me repeat, as a codification of God's command, but as the proper form of theological preparation for experience of that command.

III

The remaining three sections are books in themselves, the first on human relationships with the man-woman relationship at their head, the second on the texture of psycho-somatic life, and the third on the ethical ramifications of each man's mysterious 'placing' in the scheme of things—a region of inquiry which is not pre-ordained as a private preserve for existentialists. The pattern of discussion, in broad outline, is as follows.

First among human relationships is that of man and woman, with marriage as its centre and goal. Over against the supernaturalising of marriage in the notion of it as a 'sacrament', or the metaphysical speculations which follow upon Schleiermacher's affirmation of romantic love, Barth pleads for a measure of disenchantment. Further, by refusing to isolate in any way the discussion of physical sexuality from the total encounter of spirit-activated souls of bodies, he claims that the matter may be de-demonised as well as de-divinised. He pleads also for a de-centralised treatment which begins by looking at moments in the relationship other than the central one of marriage, for this estate is only one possibility which Christians undertake when called thereto, knowing that the relation of Christ and His Church can be presented through it. There is also a proper humanity of the unmarried, as, incidentally, there is no impairing of marriage by childlessness. Barth examines these matters with the utmost care and sympathy and incidentally produces the best exposition of St. Paul's mind which is known to me. There are three general directions in which to look for the issue between good and evil in respect of being a man or being a woman. The first of these bids each person be true to his sex, for in the diversity of man and woman (the analysis of which is necessarily precarious) there is a parable of the covenant of grace. By all means let the women dispense with veils and speak in Church provided they are not really hankering after feeling and behaving like men. And beware of the Androgyne myth, whether in the form of Berdyaev's 'sexual polarisation' or Simone de Beauvoir's existentialist de-mythologising of woman. Secondly, any attempt to evade the mystery represented by the humanity of the opposite sex is the beginning of evil. Men and women carry a mutual responsibility to sustain the challenge arising from their diversity. Thirdly, their co-ordination is cast within an irreversible 'ordering', which is dangerous to mention because the fundamental equality is so easily denied. Yet there is a precedence proper to the male, to be undertaken not by natural superiority but in subordination to God, and it calls for strength in the man and maturity in the woman. Disobedience here has for its symptoms the tyrannical man and the subservient woman, who then becomes the rebellious woman seeking to rectify the situation but at the cost of producing the weak man. Here is a *circulus vitiosus*. But against it there is a *circulus veritatis* where the mature woman educates the man's strength by winning his respect and turns him into the kind man. It is at the points of intersection of these circles that we find the questions about good and evil raised acutely.

Marriage is discussed under seven headings, but at every point Barth takes seriously its foundation in a decision of love. The choice of marriage, as of celibacy, is by call of God. It is a life association which constitutes a task in its own right which should not be subordinated to sexual satisfaction, the comfort of the wage-earner, the woman's home instinct, or the bringing up of a family. It means an obligation to realise complete community, with each partner brought to his freedom by the other. (This is peculiarly the man's concern.) It means an exclusive life-community, the safeguarding and effectuating of love's choice being inconceivable in any other terms to Christians who have experienced the community of man and God. It means partnership for *all* the common future of the two parties, but here it is important to take the radicalism of the New Testament as a summons to freedom, and it is wrong to neglect the limiting case where the painful but proper decision may have to be taken that N and M have not in fact been joined by God. To prohibit re-marriage in such circumstances is a scandalous mis-reading of commanding grace, particularly if it takes the form of refusing Christian hallowing. The hallowing of Eros, in order that the decision to marry may be reached in free and mutual love, is next discussed with rare insight. And finally the civic aspect of 'matrimony' falls into proper perspective against the clarification of the reality of marriage.

The second relationship which men enjoy by creation is that of parents and children. From the standpoint of the child, which is common to all, the 'honour' due to parents is what matters. He must respect their 'weight' as teachers and counsellors. Their bearing on his life is from the same quarter as is the bearing of God. They represent, but do not exhaustively embody, the *a priori* out of which the child has come. Their nurture represents that of God, but under the new covenant the one authentic Fatherhood, that of God, establishes a nurture for human children in Christ alongside that nurture in its parental representation. Thus, while there is a real obeying of parents, it takes place 'in the Lord' as a free and differentiated decision of obedience whose form Barth examines in the three stages of early childhood, adolescence and maturity. The bearing of this divine command on the child's re-action to palpable weaknesses in his parents calls into play all the tremendous humility and sympathy of which Barth is capable, and again he looks with care at the limiting case (much illuminated in Scripture) where the decision may have to be made to live as one without father or mother. From the standpoint of parents two matters call for preliminary clarification: the state of childlessness and the question of birth control. Here as elsewhere the generous things said by Barth are less significant than the care with which he says them and the theology from which he gets them. He goes on then to sort out the wheat from the tares in respect of such statements as that parents must always be *for* their children, that they must exercise authority over them, and that they must equip them for life; and he ends with a reminder of the limits set to parental care.

The third topic of this section deals with man's existence as a member of some *Volk* (those who are 'near') and within humanity (those who are distant). Here we have to do, not with the stringency of a Creator's command, but with the disposition of a providential Governor. Nevertheless, though there is a relativising of the sanctity of race, language and culture, it is a fruitful relativising which leaves room for the hallowing of man's historical responsibility as one of his own folk. This hallowing comes to effect in the presence amid the peoples of the covenant-history fulfilled in the one Lord Jesus Christ, which sets every form of life-with-those-who-are-near into relationship with a *centre* and with a *goal*. Life under the command of God is therefore always life 'on the way out' from the national corner to the unity of the people of God and therefore to the broad acres of 'humanity'. Here, however, as in the next section, the whole story cannot be told in the context of the doctrine of creation. Barth leaves the topic with twenty packed pages of exegesis focussed on the stories of Babel and Pentecost, which indicates what happened within Israel's own history to make room for the Church as the new people whose existence does not end that of the nations but brings to light their true significance.

IV

It is no longer possible to take for granted the 'urge to live' and Barth grounds all that he has to say about 'freedom for life' in God's command being a command to live. Barth takes very seriously the *Lebensangst* of modern men. He begins with a section on 'reverence for life', but for life as the loan of existence *qua* soul of my body. 'Reverence' is a practical exercise of my freedom based on recognition of the limits which give shape to what is loaned. It is not 'theoretical-aesthetic admiration' of life, as of something divine. The command enjoining reverence for life has its explicit Biblical form in 'Thou shalt not kill', but before he deals with the primary defensive aspect of this, Barth works out an account of its positive bearing. He deals in turn with issues raised by the instinctive levels of life, the relation of human life to that of plants and animals (showing the same delicate respect for the concern of vegetarians as he shows in so many other places for similar cases of conscience), the category of health, the achievement of *joie de vivre*, the naturalness of self-affirmation and the will to power.

When he turns to the significant negative aspect of the explicit command, in the section on the defence of life, the bearing of the command becomes more searching though not necessarily more important. Here there is an urgent unconditional protection of life, in contrast with the positive aspect where the respect which is enjoined is in every case conditioned. But when it comes down to cases, we have to face the fact that what is protected is not an unconditioned magnitude—Life, just like that! We have to reckon, therefore, with limiting cases where the relativity of the life which is unconditionally protected may permit, or even require, a proper act of killing. The New Testament identification of the coming Kingdom with the Son of Man means that these limiting cases are not to be found quite so readily as is assumed in the Old Testament which after all must now be read in the light of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ, and Christians do well to believe that the protection of human life against arbitrary extermination is almost limitless. Barth looks at eight possible cases of inflicting death; suicide, common murder, abortion, extermination of the 'worthless', euthanasia, emergency killing in self-defence, the death penalty and, finally, war. Suicide is the extreme assertion of sovereignty over one's own life and contrasts most sharply with obedience to the Lord of life which may indeed mean giving up one's life to death but in a quite different form. That it is not beyond forgiveness affords no excuse whatever. Barth maintains that here is the point where it is supremely clear that the offence in taking life is offence against the Gospel and faith, not offence against some law. And in view of known circumstances where men have been driven to suicide (one thinks of the Gestapo knocking on the door) it is most important to look at this whole field from the standpoint of God's gracious permission to men that they *shall* live and to look honestly at the possible limiting case. Again in the case of abortion, the divine No! has its root in the Gospel. Human life is upheld in freedom, in grace; otherwise we miss the point of respecting it. But this enhances rather than alleviates the gravity of critical decision. If life must be weighed against life, the decision *can* fall in favour of the mother and against the child, but no legislation should ever take the responsibility for decision away from those most directly concerned. Extermination of the 'worthless', like euthanasia, comes into the class of murder and there is no question of a limiting case. But these three possibilities are serious enough to call for serious theological exhibition of the grounds of prohibition. Self-defence and the death penalty go together for the latter is a communal instance of the former. The hallowing of the instinct for self-preservation is a question in itself and passages in the Sermon on the Mount stand in the way of any easy story at this point. Here again the limiting case is liable to be ruled out by treating the command as a law. The case for the death penalty is often thought to rest on grounds other than the Gospel, and it raises issues wider than those involved in a direct threat to the life of an individual or his immediate neighbour. Barth finds that there is little ground for practising execution as a punishment. The limiting case is that of the traitor and of the tyrant, where what is at stake is not the well-being but the actual being of the State. In regard to war, Barth does everything possible by way of sharpening conscience, but he sees a possible limiting case where a nation has to defend *within its own frontiers* an independence which on serious grounds it is not prepared to surrender—which is all very well for a Swiss, but not wholly relevant even to Czechoslovakia in 1938. Within its limits however (and these 23 pages are not a Christian Ethic of War) Barth's handling of the problem of bellicose killing, and of military service in preparation for it, is strictly to the point.

The third section of the paragraph about life deals with its industrious employment. The point about man's industry is that it co-operates with and corresponds to the activity of God. To see it as service commanded by God we begin from the work which is most clearly hallowed service, the work of the Church. This calls for clarification of what is involved in *belonging* to the Church, and incidentally of the status of the Church as a Church *for* the *Volk*, not *of* the *Volk*. Then of the responsibility which is laid upon every member by reason of the internal history in which the Church lives; each has to co-operate responsibly in maintaining the unity of the congregation, its quality of life, its theology and its practice of love. Then we turn to the Church's service in the world where the first requisite is love, the second is missionary activity, the third is clear proclamation of the Gospel, and the fourth is a prophetic declaration for right against wrong. Round this centre of the Kingdom and the community which proclaims it, God's fatherly Providence rules the entire creation, and in this periphery man has the peripheral privilege of work. The Christian understands something of the great context in which all men's work is set, and he finds the gracious necessity of it primarily in the fact that it gives to each man his point of attachment in the creation, the place where his life can be 'spent'. Here, as in the section on prayer, Barth throws what he has to say into the form of 'criteria' for right work. To work is to limit yourself to a particular job and *to identify yourself* with that self-limitation. The other criteria derive their urgency from this one, e.g. the worth and honour of what is done, the humanity with which it is done, the significance found in the doing of it, and the limitation imposed on its demands. The sociological significance of Sabbath observance receives proper consideration once these criteria have been probed.

V

The last section of this volume plays a role similar to that of *De meditatione futurae vitae* and *Quomodo utendum praesenti vita* which round off Calvin's discussion of the life of the Christian man (*Inst.* III, 6-10). What does God's command mean as addressed to man in his limited time? What is the bearing on ethics of eschatological expectation? It is precisely in his *limited* opportunity that every man is the fellow-man of Jesus Christ, called to solidarity with Him. He must regard it therefore as a form of his freedom. And again there are criteria by reference to which he knows a little more clearly how matters stand in respect of his obedience or disobedience to the command of God. To be conscious of having one's own particular place brings with it the highest degree of candour and of resolution. Further, the knowledge that one has no time to lose breeds the art of making time and taking opportunities. And above all, it is a mark of obedience to remember steadily but without fear that one must eventually die. There are notions born of fear which seem to help man overcome the fear of death, but the only *Memento mori!* which brings into life that qualified sense of its significance which is the mark of obedience is the concrete *Memento Domini!*, the knowledge of who it is who awaits me at the limit to which I am hastening. Here Barth quietly reckons with the existentialism which he has now outgrown.

He passes next to the theme of man's vocation, distinguishing between God's calling of him (*Berufung*) and the 'calling' (*Beruf*) in which he finds himself. Luther's influential treatment of this matter was by way of reaction to medieval monasticism and there is room for a truer account of man's station and calling as the *place* of his responsibility to God, not something in itself to which he is responsible. This place has certain marks which merit attention *vis-à-vis* the question about God's command. First there is the fact of being of a certain age, and Barth goes through the various stages of life to bring out their peculiarities as well as their inter-connexion. He does it with the same powerful combination of theological clarity and pastoral wisdom which is evident on every page of this volume. Next there is the fact of being set to live at a particular juncture of history, which is to be taken not as matter of determinism but as the provision of a stage whereon man may experience the calling of God. The same approach in terms of freedom applies in the case of the special abilities with which a man is endowed, and to have a cut and dried estimate of them and assess one's duties accordingly is the mark, not of obedience, but of trying to be one's own creator and lord. The last fact to be reckoned with is the range within which one counts for something, and here more depends on man's own choice of his calling than elsewhere. The theology of Providence comes to its own here, if anywhere, and the ethical question deals primarily with the problem of being true to one's chosen calling. Luther has much to teach us at this point, though the calling (which can be repudiated in favour of another with perfect obedience) is never to be regarded as a divinised *Ordnung* with its own law. What abides is not the calling in itself but the actual calling by God.

The last theme is that of human dignity, and the esteem due to man as a creature of God and as occupant of the position to which he has been called. The casual English, alone among the nations of Britain and Europe with the possible exception of the Norwegians, would probably be inclined to let this take care of itself, but it has done this one no harm to see how the rest of the world lives. The dignity of man in his station is never to be assessed except in the light of the higher dignity which he has in virtue of God's Word and command addressed to him, and the interrelation of the two kinds of honour is close. It is a dignity in service. Since it is God's free gift it is to be enjoyed only in gratitude, humility and humour. And though degrees of dignity are useful and indeed indispensible for men in their relationships, these degrees are not taken very seriously by God in His estimate of man's honour as the language about Christ's 'little ones' serves to remind us. The protection of one's honour is something which hardly troubles the man of faith except in the limiting case where his service is impaired by loss of proper dignity. And here it is the imperilled service, not the imperilled dignity, which matters. Care for the honour of others rather than for one's own is the New Testament prescription for dealing with such emergencies.

In conclusion let me quote the closing remarks of Professor Otto Weber in his summary of the volume published in the *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung* to which, in this case, my own summary owes not a little. 'The work just reviewed may be called an Ethic in the light of free grace, that free grace of God which already in Jesus Christ allows man to live in his creatureliness, establishes him in freedom and brings him honour. Man has no other life, no other freedom, no other honour. His continuing endowment is his whole wealth. And the command of the Creator is his whole freedom.'

THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPTION OF MIRACLE

by The Rev. HAROLD KNIGHT

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the significance underlying the concept of miracle in the world of Old Testament thought and theology, in the hope that the results attained may shed fresh light upon something which touches the very centre of religious life and is a frequent cause of genuine doubt and perplexity for modern man. Perhaps the word miracle itself is ambiguous in this connexion, for it has gathered around itself a penumbra of associations derived from its use in our modern scientifically determined modes of thought and speech. Broadly speaking the background which it implies is that of nature conceived as an independent system presupposing fixed laws or if, with the more modern scientific outlook we reject the notion of materialistic determinism and mechanism, then, at any rate, we must substitute for 'laws' the tendency for uniform patterns and processes to emerge. Against such large uniformities, miracle, in the modern sense, stands out somewhat sharply as an exception, mysterious and apparently inexplicable, repugnant in its arbitrariness to the spirit of pure science. Such presuppositions do not exist in the Old Testament World of ideas where we are confronted by a type of thought which is through and through theological rather than philosophical and scientific. The corner-stone of the Old Testament system of ideas is the primacy of God as self-existent Creator whose creative activity is unceasing, upholding and interpenetrating by His watchful redeeming care all that is. On Him depends nature, man, and history. All that happens in the life of physical nature is ascribed to the immediate will of the living God, whose fundamental concern is with man and his redemption. Of this process of man's redemption through the self-revealing creative action of God in history, nature is not merely the arena but also the accompaniment and reflection. Nature suffers and sorrows over the fall and sin of man, rejoices in his escapes and deliverances through the signal acts of God's mercy, and attains to a paradisaical plenteousness and rejuvenation on the full restoration of His communion with God. Thus to take only one quite obvious example, sickness and disease which for the scientifically trained mind are regarded unthinkingly as events in the process of nature, are invested for the religious man of the old Testament with an added depth and quality of significance since they are inseparable from that relationship to God in which His whole life is rooted. What for the modern agnostic thinker might be considered as showing man's inescapable bondage to nature, becomes for the Old Testament saint a visitation of the living God who in His sovereign goodness and freedom has created both man and nature.[1] Sickness may thus be seen as a terrible reminder of the awful solemn nearness of God, the touch of His finger which unerringly finds man. The whole course of nature's life is a manifestation of God's steadfast undeviating will to goodness, of His continuous creative activity, of His concern to redeem man through the cross of suffering and the inexhaustible depths of mercy and love. The pious man of the Old Testament whose gaze passes beyond all secondary causes sees the activity of God everywhere piercing and interpenetrating the world to redeem and recreate it from within. The one word *bara'* (=create) signifies the sustaining as well as the creating of the world.[2]

It is true of course that in the mature stages of its theological development, Israel reached an understanding of the organic unity and wholeness of cosmic life, while it is notorious that the Book of Job administers a sharp rebuke to any exaggerated anthropocentric tendencies. With Jeremiah, for example, we find a remarkable awareness of what we should call the uniformities of the organic life of the cosmos whose divinely established order is contrasted with the disorder in man's heart and the general mutability of human affairs.[3] Furthermore, we find again and again in the Psalms a spontaneous outburst of appreciation of the glories of nature viewed as a cosmic whole independently of the life of man.[4] But this realisation of the

[1] 1 Kings 17.17 f; Ps. 6.2 f.

[2] Exod. 34.10; Num. 16.30; Isa. 43.1, 15; Ezek. 21.35; Ps. 51.12, etc.

[3] Jer. 5.24, 8.7. [4] Ps. 8.4, 19.2, 5-7; 104.9, 19.

organic unity of the cosmos which receives its most definite and systematic expression in the priestly account of creation does not lead to anything like the climate of thought in which the mind of modern man moves. So far from the cosmos coming to be considered as a rigid mechanical system, its order and unity are felt to testify to the constancy and steadfastness of God's creative purpose yearning to reveal its inherent glory in both man and nature. All is felt to depend upon the personal will of the Creator-God who longs to manifest His goodness and set up His Kingdom at the heart of His creation. The splendours and the terrors of nature are the garment in which He clothes Himself as He comes to judge the world and establish His righteousness.

This dynamic approach to nature as a theatre which testifies to the imminence and nearness of the living God forms the true background for an understanding of the OT conception of miracle. In a world of thought where the whole of creation is conceived as rooted in the steadfast purpose of God to reveal Himself and manifest His glory, and would cease to exist apart from the continuous operation of that purpose, miracle cannot be sufficiently explained as a temporary suspension of nature's laws in the interest of some higher object, or as a wonder surpassing, if not contradicting, the normal ordered processes of nature. It should be interpreted rather as an intensified supreme expression of that which is the fundamental meaning of nature or creation as a whole. In accordance with this meaning, miracle may be defined as the manifestation of the divine glory in mighty acts or phenomena which arouse in man the emotions of awe and amazement, and subdue his heart to adoration and submission. The very words used in the Hebrew Old Testament to denote what we should call miracle suggest such an interpretation. Thus we have the term *beriy'ah*[1] (=a product of creative action) implying that miracle is a fresh revelation of the creative energies of God pointed now to some concrete situation of human need and supplication. *Niph^{e}la'ah*[2] (=a wonder or marvel) suggests the power of miracle to arouse astonishment, *nora'*[3] (=a terrible thing), its capacity to subdue the human heart with fear and awe, *g^{e}burah*[4] (=a deed of power) its manifestation of the plenitude of divine power, *ma'ᵉlal* and *ma'ᵉseh*[1] (=an action) its aspect as a deed flowing from an output of divine energy. The mere mention of these terms and their connotation brings us at once to the heart of the New Testament account of the miracles of our Lord which were felt by their witnesses to be mighty deeds exciting awe, fear and amazement in the beholders and were characterised by our Lord Himself as a working of the works of God. In passing we may note that such an approximation points decisively to the indissoluble unity of the Old and New Testament. A specially frequent term in the Hebrew OT is *mopheth*[2] (=a wondrous sign and token) and *oth*[2]—in the sense of a premonitory sign suggesting a whole context of rich significance, an adumbration of a cycle of events in which man is tensely confronted by the self-revealing will and action of God. The essential mark of a miracle for the pious Israelite is furnished not by its supernatural character, but by its richness and depth of significance as a revelatory event. Hence it comes about that faith alone can discern this miraculous quality. It is a question here of the insight required to appreciate the fulness of significance of an event which points beyond itself to the dimension of infinity and eternity in which it is ultimately set. Thus miracle, according to this Biblical conception, should be defined as the special quality of an event in which faith apprehends the answer of God to human need, the coming of God to transform a human situation, the finger of God pointing to some ultimate dimension of meaning in human affairs. Such events may be natural or supernatural—that is a secondary and subordinate issue. The essential thing is the surprising unforeseeable aspect in the culmination of a series of circumstances, which strikes the attention, seizes the heart and mind of man, convincing him that here God is at work, not necessarily interfering with the logical development of things, but secretly shaping them and transforming their inner meaning in conformity with His inscrutable wisdom and in fulfilment of His hidden purposes. The immediate impression for faith is the conviction that here, in this set of circumstances with their unforeseen issue, lies a point at which the vertical dimension of God's self-revelation intersects the horizontal working out of human affairs. Without miracle we have an ultimately meaningless interplay of natural and human cause and effect, and history resolves itself into a series of patterns and rhythms which cry aloud for some absolute and comprehensive meaning and truth which of themselves they are powerless to yield. Miracle is essentially the sudden revelation of transcendent truth and reality, the conviction of the challenge of God and the activity of God at the heart of human life. For this reason only the religious man whose life is based upon faith can discern it. No external sign can guarantee its presence, no mechanically applicable criterion can evaluate it. To insist on the presence of the sheer supernatural element—miracle in the ordinary sense—shows a comparatively crude and unspiritual outlook. It would be like insisting on ecstasy or trance or some psychological abnormality as an infallible mark of the genuineness and quality of the prophetic or mystical consciousness. It would be to confuse the formal and extrinsic aspect of things with their inner value and worth. The authority and genuineness of miracle in the deeper sense consists in the intrinsic quality of an event which faith apprehends as specially and intensely revealing of the impingement of God upon human affairs, of man's confrontation by the Word and power of God, —the ultimate meaning and truth, the final judgment and mercy.

---

[1] Exod. 34.10; Jer. 31.22.

[2] Exod. 3.20; Judges 6.13.

[3] 2 Sam. 7.23.

[4] Ps. 20.7, 106.2.

---

[1] Ps. 9.12; Isa. 12.4.

[2] Isa. 8.18, 20.3; Exod. 4.21; Judges 6.17, 36 f; Ps. 105.3, 135.9.

Miracle in the Old Testament sense is that which testifies to the saving presence and power and nearness of God in human life. Miracle testifies to the freedom and sovereignty of God who controls and redeems nature, man, and history. Events are not just left to work themselves out according to their own inner logic, as by some natural fatalistic necessity. Even while manifesting this inner logic they are seen to be subsumed beneath a higher order of reality, to be subdued to an unceasing divine activity which is fulfilling an eternal purpose. It is obvious that some of the critical turning points in Israel's history were interpreted as miracle by the religious consciousness of that people. Some of these, e.g. the drying up of the Red Sea or the unexpected defeat of Sennacherib's army, may be susceptible of a purely naturalistic interpretation, while others, e.g. the plagues of Egypt or the feeding by manna in the wilderness, may evince the distortions of oral tradition or an inadequate understanding of the processes of nature. But the point is that such events are constituted as miraculous, not as a result of any scientific analysis of their causation, but by the interpretation which they receive in an awakened and sensitive religious consciousness. In these circumstances which the rational man might describe as coincidences or mysterious phenomena, the religious man with the ear of faith hears the approaching footsteps of God who is ever active towards man in history for the fulfilling of the ends He has chosen. Whatever may be the patterns of meaning which the philosophically or scientifically trained intelligence may discern in the sequences of history, such meanings will always be in part confusing and unsatisfying, and perhaps we may add, the more profound and searching such a non-religious intelligence, the more it will appear that history has no total and comprehensive meaning. Miracle is that which breaks down such an outlook and testifies to the irruption of a series of events within history, which, for the alert religious consciousness, disclose a Power at work to reveal Himself on the plane of history and to control it that it may subserve His will to righteousness and universal redemption.

Israel was peculiarly fitted to achieve this understanding of miracle though its powerful sense of history as the sphere in which God works. It is deeply consonant with this Jewish outlook that Our Lord in the fourth Gospel should have insisted that He must work the works of God while it is yet day. It is inevitable that miracle should be inwrought into the story of Israel for the reason that that story is the record of God's action in history to achieve the salvation of mankind through the formation, guidance, and redemption of a people peculiar to Himself. Miracle is something which adumbrates the mighty sequences of events in which God's judgment and saving action are manifested in such a way as to lead man to self-surrender, submission and trust in the power and will thus revealed. Miracle belongs essentially to times of crisis and decision when faith is stretched to its uttermost intensity. In this connexion we may think alike of the great turning points in the history of Israel—the exodus from Egypt, the struggle of Elijah against Baal, the menace of Jerusalem by the Assyrian—or of the great turning points in the drama of the second world war or of those which mark the vicissitudes of the individual life. In every case the event and its interpretation are distinguished by the sudden realisation of the saving nearness of God, that the nation or the individual is held invincibly in the grasp of an almighty love and power.

It would however be false and shallow to conclude from this that the object of miracle is invariably to save man from distress, to exempt him from evil and to minister to his security and comfort. At times and always at the last, man is saved as by fire, by the threat of annihilation, by pain and trial, by anguish and bewilderment. The object of miracle is not to rescue man from evil in such a way as might minister to human pride and complacency, but to strengthen man's hold upon the saving reality of God so that he may endure all things without the special help of miraculous manifestations. Similarly it has always been the experience of the mystics that in the earlier stages of the spiritual life God sustains the soul by the special favour of visions and unusual uplifting experiences. Later, these are withdrawn and the soul tastes the bitterness of apparent abandonment by God. So the Old Testament conception of miracle makes it appear as a crucial time of testing which may lead either to salvation or judgment. So in the wake of the great Old Testament miracles is manifested the divine retribution upon the human tendency to arrogation and self-absorption which would turn God's mercies and favours into an instrument of self-will and pride. We need only think of Isaiah's struggles to combat the foolish patriotism and false sense of security which his message of deliverance induced. Thus the true function of miracle, according to the Old Testament conception, is that as a part of a greater whole which it foreshadows it should announce in a way which challenges the response of faith God's intention to establish His Kingdom on earth and to gather man into a communion of faith and love wherein His sovereignty will be realised, His goodness embodied.

ST. ANSELM—A REVALUATION

by THE REV. C. R. WALKER

WHAT is to be thought of St. Anselm? That question is likely to recur with the approaching completion of the new and definitive edition of Anselm's works by the Scottish firm of Nelson.[1] This paper attempts to give a limited answer by a fresh consideration of Anselm's character, with special reference to his *Meditations and Prayers*.

Anselm is generally acknowledged to be one of the great thinkers of medieval Christendom. His powers as a metaphysician are amply displayed in his *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, while his *Cur Deus Homo* marks one of the milestones in the Church's progressive apprehension of the mystery of the Atonement. So powerful indeed is the impact of these treatises that Anselm has been compared with St. Augustine. *Augustinus redivivus* is a proud title; but Anselm has been thought worthy to bear it.

When we turn to the man himself, we are apt to be overawed by the halo of sanctity which time and tradition have woven round him. We see him, through the eyes of his biographers, setting out from Aosta, after a childhood of great promise and innocence; arriving at Bec, where in due course he succeeded the distinguished Lanfranc as abbot, and where his wisdom and charity made him beloved by his monks; thence to Canterbury, where he dimmed Lanfranc's glory a second time and became such a champion of the Church and the Papacy in their struggle with the kings of England, as to merit canonisation for that part of his life alone. Seen through the mists of centuries Anselm has become a legendary figure, a model of holiness, courage, and industry, a worker of miracles also, and a medieval saint of the first order.

One consequence of the chorus of laudation which runs through Anselm's biographies is that the saint himself is liable to become unreal, a pale medieval abstraction rather than a man of flesh and blood. He may resemble Augustine in intellectual grasp, but Augustine is far more interesting to the general reader by reason of his frank admission of moral failure. There are no 'Confessions' of St. Anselm, and to that extent at least Anselm falls short of his great predecessor. We get near Augustine. We remain far off in fellow feeling as in time from Anselm.

---

[1] *S. ANSELMI, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi. OPERA OMNIA.* Ad fidem codicum recensuit Franciscus Salesius Schmitt. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd. £2 2s. per volume.

The most voluminous of Anselm's biographers, Martin Rule, is probably the chief offender. Valuable though Rule's biography[1] is (and for wealth of detail and painstaking research it will not easily be superseded) it errs by sheer enthusiasm for its subject, and by hero worship. The biographer has so completely fallen under the spell of his hero that he looks upon him as quite faultless, superhuman, in fact. A telling sentence in Eadmer's biography, touching upon a presumably wild period in Anselm's youth is naïvely glossed over. Rule even goes so far as to deny that Anselm's early years 'bear the faintest trace of a moment's conscious sin'!

This assertion does not commend Anselm to the critical modern reader; it merely makes much that follows in the biography appear incredible. Even Eadmer, whose charming biography has put all later writers in his debt, grudgingly allows but a single sentence to the painful episode in Anselm's life. Ermenberga, Anselm's mother, having died, *illico navis cordis ejus quasi anchora perdita in fluctus saeculi pene tota dilapsa est.*[2] But lest the reader might draw grave conclusions and suppose that the anchor of his soul was 'quite' lost, Eadmer hastens to add that God overruled Anselm's lapse by fomenting discord between Gundulf and himself, ending in Anselm's abrupt departure from home.

Only one of Anselm's older biographers, to my knowledge, points out flaws in Anselm's character, Dr Hook, Dean of Chichester, whose *Lives of the Archibishops of Canterbury* was published in 1862, some twenty years earlier than Rule's monumental *Life*. Hook may be grossly unfair to Anselm when he deals with the conflict between Anselm and King Henry, accusing him of pride and stubbornness and ignorance where many have seen only courage and principle, but he does a real service by indicating the double strain in Anselm's heredity, and in stressing the evil influence of Gundulf, in whom it is worth noting there is a distinct resemblance to Patritius, the father of Augustine. Hook is refreshingly direct. 'If Anselm inherited a sweet disposition and a kind and gentle heart from his mother, the abbot knew how often that mother's heart was almost broken by the selfishness and dissipation of her husband, Gundulf. . . . When Ermenberga died soon after, the suspicions of the abbot proved to be correct. . . . Corrupted by the example of a careless and profligate father the young man was hurried into acts rather than habits of dissipation. In after life Anselm deplored the immoralities of his youth.'[1]

---

[1] M. Rule, *Life and Times of St. Anselm* (pub. 1883).

[2] Eadmer, *vita*, Lib. I, c. I, para. 4.

What then is the truth concerning Anselm? How are we to strike the balance between the faultily faultless saint portrayed by Rule, and the sinner become saint of Dean Hook? Which of them comes nearer reality?

It is just here that Anselm's *Meditations and Prayers* become invaluable. I have said that Anselm left no Confessions like Augustine. The *Meditations and Prayers* however, might be held to take the place of Confessions in Anslem's case. For that reason their evidence is all the more interesting.

At this point a slight digression may be pardoned, relating as it does to the severe pruning of older editions of Anselm's devotional works.

To any one acquainted with the *Meditations and Prayers* as they appear in the Migne (or Gerberon) edition, the latest edition cannot but give a shock of surprise. For whereas the Migne edition contains twenty-one Meditations and seventy-five Prayers, Nelson's edition includes only three Meditations, and nineteen Prayers,—the others, in both kinds, being considered spurious.

At first sight the loss of so many meditations and prayers looks serious. Every student of the Migne edition must admit that some of the Meditations could well be dispensed with, not merely on the ground of doubtful authenticity both in style and matter, but because they are uninspiring and dull—mere monastic exercises in Biblical exposition, and that of a simple kind. There are exceptions, however. It is with a wrench that we part with the Meditation in which appears the famous soliloquy on the brevity and uncertainty of life, pictured as a veritable Bridge of Sighs. 'Imagine to thyself a valley deep and dark, and all manner of torments in the bottom thereof. Suppose moreover a bridge cast across this valley, exceedingly long, but of no more than a foot's breadth. Let a man be compelled to pass over this bridge, so straight, so high, and so perilous. Let his eyes be blindfolded, that he cannot see his steps; let his hands be bound behind him, so that he cannot guide himself by groping his way with a staff. How great would be the fear and distress of mind in such an one. Imagine moreover, a monstrous multitude of savage birds hovering about the bridge, and seeking to drag the traveller as he crosseth it, down into the depths.'[1] Whoever was the author of that soliloquy had a spiritual imagination worthy of Bunyan, and with or without the name of Anselm it will surely continue to stand out from the mass of Meditations formerly ascribed to him. One can understand the enthusiasm with which Rule, while visiting Aosta, the saint's birthplace, identified the bridge of the soliloquy with the Pont D'ael of Aosta! It may also come as a surprise to the student of the older editions to find that certain Last Judgment scenes gloomily impressive and in Anselm's vein, have been ruthlessly removed from the new edition.

---

[1] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. II, p. 172.

The interesting fact is, however, that the three Meditations which have survived the latest editor's pruning knife show us Anselm brooding over the sins of his youth; and the surviving Prayers are also self-revealing.

Before attempting to scan the lineaments of Anselm's soul through this part of his works, let us briefly estimate the value of his *Meditations and Prayers* as a little book of Devotion.

De Quincey, in his pride of classical learning, asserted that he had read À Kempis in his youth, not so much for devotional purposes as 'to laugh at Tom's Latinity'. But here there is no room for ridicule. As one biographer wrote: 'The monkish teaching fell on receptive soil. Anselm's Latinity, which is so sinewy and flexible as to read like his mother tongue, and his power of incisive analysis prove how honest was the work the Benedictines wrought in their priory among the Alps.'[2] Even the best English translations of parts of the Meditations fall below the original in impressiveness, and nowhere probably can the supplicatory power of sonorous Latin be heard to better advantage than in Anselm's Prayers.

---

[1] Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.*, *Tom. clviii*, col. 719 (Dr Bigg's translation).

[2] A. C. Welch, *Anselm and his Work*, p. 15.

But if the form of the *Meditationes sive Orationes* is beyond reproach, for popular appeal Anselm's Devotions come far short of the *Imitation*—not to speak of the *Confessions*, to which in my opinion they yet bear a certain kinship of personal experience. These *Meditations and Prayers* are narrow and intense and personal to a degree. But if the reader desires to see a great Christian going up to the temple to pray in close fellowship with the dejected but justified publican, he will see him here: and to keep company with this master mind of medieval Europe as he beats upon his breast and cries 'God have mercy upon me, a sinner', cannot but prove a searching and salutary experience.

Returning to the contention that Anselm, like Augustine, was deeply conscious of moral failure in his youth and continued to bewail it, it seems to me impossible for any one to read the three Meditations before us without coming to this conclusion—unless of course, he attempts to prove, like Rule, that Anselm either did not write the *Meditations*, or wrote them for the private benefit of a monk who had grievously sinned. Men do not commonly write meditations for such a purpose as this last. Such well-known books of meditations as those of Descartes, Marcus Aurelius, Fenelon and Traherne—to take four widely divergent examples—are the inner and private reflections of their authors written to ease the overcharged mind or soul, without thought of the spiritual conflicts of others. In any case Anselm was a voluminous letter writer, and he (like Fenelon) gave spiritual counsel through his letters, as to the monks of Bec in general and to Osbern in particular.

No, the *Meditations* are pure autobiography, let who will deny it, especially the Second (or *Med. III* in Migne). Here, if at all, Anselm makes open confession of the years when 'the ship of his soul was cast anchorless upon the floods', and the confession is similar to Augustine's. Lust darkened the early years of both men, and if Anselm's sin appears to have taken the form of impulsive deeds rather than a settled habit, as Hook generously suggests, yet Anselm had less excuse than

Augustine, having been baptised into the faith in his early years and brought up in a settled Christian society. But let us hear what this remorse-stricken monk, this *monachus monachorum*, as he has been called, has to say of his past.

The title of this *Meditation* (No. II in Nelson) is plain and direct, 'Lamentation for Virginity wickedly lost', *Deploratio virginitatis male amissae.*

In the first part Anselm summons his soul to shake off its torpor and apprehend the enormity of his sin, thus to cast away what had been purified at the baptismal font, endowed by the Holy Spirit, sworn to profess Christianity and betrothed to Christ. *Intende, infelix, intende sceleris tui horrorem. Tu, inquam, quae quondam candidata coelesti lavacro, dotata spiritu sancto, in Christiana professione jurata, virgo fuisti Christo desponsata.*[1] How he laments the folly which soiled his mind and gravely injured his soul, hurling him down from a glorious and happy state and resulting in a loss inconsolable and a torment intolerable. *O fornicatio sordidatrix mentis meae, perditrix animae meae, de quam nitido de quam jucundo statu me praecipitasti! . . . Hinc est damnum inconsolabile, tormentum intolerabile.*

The penitent monk then admits the justice of God in filling his mind with grief and terror while he contemplates his iniquity. The fornicator himself ought to keep before him the torments he has deserved, for if he fears to be exposed before God, at least he can keep his punishment before his own eyes. *Si timet exhiberi ante conspectum Dei sui, justum est ut habeat ante conspectum suum tormenta sceleris sui.* And what torments they will be—infernal fire and flames and billowing smoke whirled about with terrible rumblings, into the midst of which the sinner will be hurled! *Ignis sulphureus, flamma tartarea et caliginosa volumina, quam terrifico rugitu video vos rotari.*

Finally he pleads with God to save him from the fiery demons and not to be so attentive to His servant's evil as to forget His own goodness. *Noli, Domine, noli sic attendere malum meum ut obliviscaris bonum Tuum.* But he will trust in God's mercies. 'It is true that my penitence cannot give satisfaction' he concludes, 'but it is certain that Thy pity may overcome my offence.'

---

[1] Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.*, *Tom. clviii*, col. 725. Throughout the article the text is from Migne.

It is well nigh impossible to see in this meditation anything else than a most moving confession of a youthful lapse in Anselm's own life, followed by years of agonised repentance and remorse. And if we turn to the next *Meditation*, whose very title is significant[1]—*De terrore judicii, ad excitandum in se timorem*—the impression is only deepened. Here we have a powerful and gloomy soliloquy upon the author's sinful nature and his terror as he contemplates the Day of Judgment, and the horrors of Hell he has deserved to suffer; closing with an impassioned prayer to Jesus to save him from perdition and to admit him into the number of the elect.

From first to last this meditation, like the previous one, is overburdened with the writer's awareness of his foul offence before God. *Terret me vita mea* is his impressive opening. 'My life makes me afraid, because when diligently examined it seems to be either wholly sinful or almost wholly barren. If any fruitfulness appears in it, that fruitfulness is either a pretence or imperfect, or in some manner corrupt, so that it fails to please God, and is even a positive displeasure to Him.' 'My soul is weary of life' he continues a little further on, 'I blush to live, I shudder to die' (*vivere erubesco, mori pertimesco*). 'What therefore remains to thee, O sinner' he continues, 'but to lament thy whole life, that thy whole life may deplore itself.'

So he passes to a vivid picture of *Dies Irae*, as something both terrible and imminent, a day of tribulation and anguish, of calamity and misery, of darkness and mist, and the sound of the trumpet, when the voice of God Himself will be distasteful. What will he answer God in that day when the whole conduct of his life, to the shutting of an eye (*ictum oculi*) will be required of him, and no other penitence or amendment will be permitted.

With such a prospect ought not he, a great sinner, to weep day and night with wailing upon wailing—'for He will judge who is now most longsuffering, but then will be most severe, now so kind then so just'—*qui nunc patientissimus, tunc districtissimus, clementissimus nunc, justissimus tunc.* On that dread day, 'to hide will be impossible, to appear intolerable'. So he moves on to the familiar prayer to the merciful Jesus. Surely He will look upon the sinner who calls Him by name, for what does the name of Jesus mean but Saviour, a name sweet and delightful and comforting to the sinner, a name of blissful hope—*nomen dulce*, *nomen delectabile*, *nomen comfortans peccatorem*, *et beatae spei*.

---

[1] Migne, loc. cit., col. 722-725.

The third Meditation differs from the other two, being neither so introspective nor so swathed in unrelieved gloom. Its title is more cheerful,[1] *De Redemptione Humana*, and it resembles his great treatise on the Atonement. After calling upon his soul to ponder her redemption and to savour the honeyed sweetness of His Redeemer's goodness, for did not one man by suffering the death of the body deliver souls from death? Anselm proceeds to discuss the mystery of Jesus' Incarnation. 'Why didst Thou conceal virtue so great under such humility?' he asks. Jesus owed no debt of this kind either to the Devil or to man. He suffered of His own free will, and because human nature in this way only could satisfy God. His divine nature was not humiliated, but His human nature was exalted. Moreover God exercised no compulsion, though the cup of suffering came from God. Christ paid the price of our debt once for all, so that true penitents in all ages can claim the benefits of the Cross.

Then he charges his soul to dwell upon the mode of her deliverance, and to taste and chew and inwardly digest it as he eats and drinks the flesh and blood of his Redeemer. *Hoc mandat*, *o homo*, *hoc ruminet*, *hoc sugat*, *hoc glutiat cor tuum*, *cum ejusdem Redemptoris tui*, *carnem et sanguinem accipit os tuum*. Nor let him forget the burden of original sin which (like Bunyan's pilgrim) he had carried on his back till Christ removed it from him—*pondus originalis peccati deorsum me trahebat*.

The conclusion strikes a characteristic note of doubt. In return for such love, he owes his whole life—*meipsum totum*—but is his love for Christ merely a matter of the intellect, or is his affection brought into it? 'Make me to taste by love what I taste by the understanding. Give me an entrance into the little chamber of Thy love.' He may love God with all his mind, but does he love Him with all his heart? Such is the note of dubiety and self reproach upon which he closes.

The evidence of the *Prayers* need not detain the reader long. Let it suffice here to say that the same feeling of unpardonable sin runs through the prayers as is found in the *Meditations*.

---

[1] Migne, loc. cit., col. 762-769.

Take for example the three consecutive prayers dedicated respectively to St. John the Baptist, to St. Peter and to St. Paul. The sub-title in each case is in itself an indication of the gloomy trend of Anselm's thought: 'Concerning remembrance of sins' (*De recordatione peccatorum*), 'with mournful deprecation of sins' (*Cum lamentabili deploratione peccatorum*), and 'With fear of the last Judgment and of sins' (*Cum terrore judicii extremi et peccatorum*).

In the prayer to St. John the Baptist,[1] Anselm after describing himself as an abominable worm and a wretched little man—*ad te venit scelerosus vermis, aerumnosus homuncio*—beseeches John the Baptist to take his part and out of pity lift up the dejected sinner, even as the grace of God sanctified the Baptist himself. *Memento ergo domine, ut sicut gratia Dei te sic sublimavit, sic misericordia tua erigat quem culpa sua sic humiliavit.* So sinful is the suppliant that he has not only despised the grace which saved him from wrath, but he is worse than the Devil himself, for *he* was hardened against one who punished him but Anselm rebels against one who is kind to him—*ille obduratus ad punientem, ego obturatus ad blandientem.* So sinful is he that he cannot tolerate the sight of his own soul, yet if he does not look, death is inevitable. *Si me video, horror est intolerabilis; si non video, mors est inevitabilis.* 'Spare, spare the sinner, God', is his last cry, 'if he despair not of thy goodness. Renew in me the grace of Thy baptism.'

In the prayer to St. Peter[2] the thought of his baptism still rankles. Sinner as he is, at least he has not denied the faith of his baptism, and that is his only plea. Addressing St. Peter, he continues: 'If beneath squalor so great thou canst not recognise the face washed and made white in Christ's font—*faciem lotam et canditatam in fonte Christi*—recognise the voice of confession made in the name of Christ, who thrice asking thee if thou didst love Him, thrice said to thee, Feed my sheep.'

In the prayer to St. Paul,[3] Anselm is again in the depths as he contemplates God's unerring judgment on himself—'accused not of one nor of few but of innumerable offences, not only small but also great offences, not doubtful, but certain'. This is followed by the characteristic plaint that while his mind perceives all this, his heart does not feel it. 'Thus the reason teaches, but the heart does not grieve.' And the dismal conclusion—'Miserable sinner, if so it be, nothing remains to thee but to cease from hope, and to silence prayer, and so lie forever in thine own wretchedness.'

---

[1] Migne, loc. cit., col. 967-972.

[2] ibid., loc. cit., col. 972-975.

[3] ibid., loc. cit., col. 975-985.

The recollection of St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith revives his hope for a little, as he looks to Jesus and says, almost in the words of the hymn,

> sheltered near Thy side,
> I may my fierce accuser face,
> And tell him, Thou hast died.

Doubt again assails his soul, for though faith is good, faith without good works is dead, and he has only evil works to show, therefore he is dead—*sed si sterilis bonorum mortuus est, fertilis malorum quanto magis mortuus est?* His last word is as near despair as a Christian's could be. He has been raised from death by baptism (how his baptismal vows reproach him!) only to descend to death through his passions and depravity. His only hope is in the resurrection power of Christ.

It may be objected to the autobiographical interpretation of the *Meditationes sive Orationes* that if the theory that they were written as acts of reparation for others who had sinned be untenable, yet much of the gloom and pessimism ought to be attributed to the medieval Catholicism in which Anselm was reared, and in particular to the influence of Augustine. 'The deep Catholic pessimism towards mortal life is Augustine's in full measure. . . . The end of those who do not belong to the City of God will be *miseria sempiterna*, which is also called the second death, since the soul, alienated from God, cannot be said to live, nor that body be said to live, which is enduring eternal pains. . . . Only imaginative elaboration was needed to expand them (i.e. Augustine's exposition of the punishment of the damned in Book XXI of the *City of God*) to the full compass of medieval fear.'[1] So writes an authority on medieval thought. Nor will it be forgotten that at the other end of the long era of fear, we see Luther, outdoing the austerity of the Augustinian Eremites because of final Judgment. How could a sensitive mind like Anselm's grow in such an atmosphere and not be overwhelmingly conscious of the dire penalty of an inward sinfulness of desire apart from overt acts of rebellion against God?

---

[1] H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind*, p. 65.

Or again, might not these *Meditations and Prayers* be regarded as merely spiritual exercises not unlike Ignatius' *Exercises*, in which the sinner is encouraged to imagine the terrors of Hell to rouse his torpid soul. Others besides Ignatius have recognised that there is an early imperfect stage in the spiritual life when nothing more salutary than deep remorse for sin and a consideration of the terrors of Judgment, especially when linked with the 'consideration that no less a price would serve for the reparation of the soul from sin than the bloody passion of the Son of God'.[1] J. H. Newman in his *Dream of Gerontius* shows the efficacy of such exercises in the speech of the Angel to the soul of Gerontius. When the Soul asks the Angel why he has no fear of Judgment after death when

> Along my earthly life, the thought of death
> And judgment was to me most terrible.
> I had it aye before me and I saw
> The Judge severe e'en in the Cruxifix

the Angel answers

> It is because
> Then thou didst fear, that now thou canst not fear.
> Thou hast forestalled the agony, and so
> For thee the bitterness of death is past.

Might not Anselm too have risen to such a thought of mercy in Judgment?

Against these interpretations of Anselm's gloomy self-reproaches and bitter remorse it ought to be kept in mind that Anselm had sufficient independence of mind and enough experiential faith in Christ not to linger so long under the shadow of death and hell without good cause. Like the psalmist he is vexed that '*my* sin is ever before *Thee*', his own flagrant offence ever in the sight of God. It was the same with Lancelot Andrewes. Readers of Alexander Whyte's introduction to the *Preces Privatae* of Andrewes will remember how Whyte probes into the reason for the inordinate place occupied by Confession and Deprecation in Andrewes' prayers, and comes to the conclusion that Andrewes had cause to lament because of his part in the scandalous divorce case of the Earl and Countess of

---

[1] Baker, *Holy Wisdom*, p. 399.

Essex. As Whyte put it (and the similarity in the positions of the two men is plain) 'For a man like Lancelot Andrewes to have to look back all his days and that, too, from an episcopal throne to that scandalous Essex case—out of the belly of hell, cried I.' Our belief in the sincerity of Anselm, as of Andrewes, gives us the greater assurance of the reality of his penitence, and the heinousness of his offence.

Finally, it ought to be said that the glory of Anselm's character in his maturity is in no wise dimmed by a frank admission of moral failure in his early years, not dimmed but rather enhanced. If we look critically at Anselm's childish dream of climbing the Alps to meet God and to inform Him of the indolence of certain reapers he had seen in the fields—so exquisitely related by Eadmer[1]—and feel that he narrowly escapes being a pious little tell-tale; if further, we believe that Anselm inherited a wild strain from his father, and in the heat of his youth committed certain excesses for which he mourned ever afterwards; if finally, we see in his *Meditations* and his *Prayers* both a confession of deadly sin and a horror of Judgment upon his sin, is it not all the more wonderful to watch the saint's gradual growth in grace as well as in intellectual power, as he passes through the lengthy penance of his monastic life at Bec and is dragged into the limelight at Canterbury, not only as the champion of the Church against the State but as the chief ornament of European Christendom in his time? Truly might he then look back and say with St. Paul, 'By the grace of God, I am what I am.'

---

[1] Eadmer, *Vita*, c. I, para. 2 (Migne).

THE ECUMENICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ANGLICANISM

by THE REV. SHERWIN BAILEY, PH.D.

SUCH generous and sympathetic recognition of the ecumenical importance of Anglicanism as that expressed by Professor Manson in his paper on *Church and Intercommunion*[1] is always both inspiring and humbling to Anglicans who feel the pain of separation from their Christian brethren. They believe that God is calling the Anglican Church to play a difficult but important role in the healing of Christian divisions, and cannot but be encouraged when they find, among members of other Churches, an appreciation of what Professor Manson calls the 'immense ecumenical potentiality' of Anglicanism. But if Anglicanism is to be in any real sense an 'instrument of ecumenical *rapprochement*', both Anglicans and non-Anglicans must understand clearly what it is and what it is not; much confusion exists because it has been misrepresented both from within and from without, by those who would have it, or suppose it to be, something other than it really is. To define Anglicanism, however, is far from easy, for it has an elusive and, indeed, a unique quality, but I hope to suggest in this paper certain lines at least along which better understanding may be sought, and to remove one or two of the more obvious misconceptions which tend to confuse discussion and to exacerbate controversy.

For certain of these misconceptions it would seem that the term 'Anglicanism' is itself responsible, though no one has discovered a satisfactory substitute. To some, it suggests 'Church-of-England-ism', and it is surprising how often 'Anglican' and 'Church of England' are used as if they were synonymous and interchangeable. It is, of course, true that Anglicanism is a typical product of the English genius; that it emerged from a historical situation peculiar in many respects to England; and that its principles find their clearest expression in the writings of the divines of the Church of England—particularly those of the seventeenth century. But to infer from this that Anglicanism is essentially local and provincial, and possesses little or no relevance outside its English context, is to mistake its character and to misunderstand the historical causes which brought it into being.

---

[1] In the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. iv, No. 1.

Furthermore, 'Anglicanism' is sometimes treated as equivalent to 'High-Church-ism'. Undoubtedly theologians of what may be called the old High Church school of thought in the Church of England helped to formulate its principles and to elaborate its method. But the principles and the method of Anglicanism, as such, are not the exclusive possession of any ecclesiastical party—in fact, they imply a radical criticism of such parties. Moreover, the meanings of party labels change, and it would certainly be inaccurate to identify Anglicanism with any particular group within the Anglican Church of today.

Nor should it be overlooked that 'Anglicanism', even when used correctly, is a term not without ambiguity. It can mean that particular combination of ecclesiastical polity, doctrinal system, and liturgical practice by which the Anglican Church everywhere is distinguished. Or it can be employed in a restricted sense to denote the principles and method which moulded and gave characteristic form to that polity, system, and practice. It can even describe the ethos of the Anglican Church, the spirit which finds expression in Anglican institutions, worship, and theology. I believe that the second and third, or limited, connotations have greater ecumenical significance than the first, if only because it is possible for the Anglican to commend them to non-Anglicans without giving the impression that submission to Canterbury is the only solution to Christian disunity that he can offer. Despite the intimate connexion between an institution and its informing spirit, some distinction in terminology would seem desirable here, and I hope it will make for clarity if, in this paper, I venture to use 'Anglicanism' only for the principles, method, and ethos of the Anglican Church.

Anglicanism did not originate as a doctrinal or ecclesiastical system on the basis of which the English Reformation was carried through, although there is no disputing the fact that its character has been determined very considerably by the peculiar features both of continuity and of discontinuity between the

English Church and the medieval Western Church. It emerged almost accidentally as the result of an impressive and successful justification of the Church of England as Catholic but not Papalist, reformed but not Calvinian or Puritan. Anglicanism does not stand for a judicious compromise between the extremes of Rome and Geneva—a *via media* plotted with caution and trodden delicately and circumspectly; nor for an eclectic and artificial system designed to secure the best of both worlds, in which heterogeneous and conflicting elements are held in uneasy juxtaposition. Rather, it was born of a battle for existence fought upon two fronts at once; consequently it has a dynamic quality not usually associated with the schemes of the conference hall or the excogitations of the study. It would not be an exaggeration to say that through its reformation and the necessity for maintaining it, the English Church discovered Anglicanism as a principle of theology and a way of Christian life.

The circumstances in which Anglicanism crystallised explain, not only its special importance for the ecumenical discussion, but also its universal relevance. Subjected to the simultaneous pressure of two opposed religious systems, both containing a mixture of truth and error and both claiming exclusive authority for their expositions of the Faith, it became the vocation of the Anglican Church to bear witness to the following principles. First, no single ecclesiastical system can embody or secure a monopoly of the whole of Christian truth. Anglicanism, therefore, implies affirmation of the truths and insights proclaimed by Romanism and Calvinism, as well as rejection of their distinctive errors. Second, eternal truth, as apprehended by the finite mind, often has a double polarity. Anglicanism, therefore, fully recognises the antinomies with which the Christian is confronted, and asserts that the truth itself is frequently to be discovered in the tension within them; they cannot easily, if at all, be resolved neatly within the compass of a formulary or definition. Hence F. D. Maurice, whose thought provides many clues to the understanding of Anglicanism, protested against the sectarian tendency to treat partial or one-sided truth as the whole truth, and declared that

> . . . the English Church, so far from being a competitor in the provision of religious systems, was a witness to man's deliverance from them.[1]

---

[1] A. R. Vidler, *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, p. 212.

Anglicanism's testimony to these two principles alone makes it something of more than local significance. The Anglican way and theory were worked out on English soil and in the context of *ecclesia Anglicana*, and naturally find characteristic expression in the polity and the Prayer Book of the Church of England and the other provinces of the Anglican Communion. But this does not mean that Anglicanism is fundamentally insular and national—still less, that it is tied to, and depends upon the English Establishment.[1] I have laboured this point because non-Anglicans often assume that acceptance of Anglican insights or principles implies submission to the hegemony of Canterbury—an erroneous assumption which cannot but affect reunion discussions, and would be vigorously repudiated by any Scottish Episcopalian!

To understand Anglicanism it is important to remember that, despite the theories and the activities of the more extreme reformers, the English Reformation was essentially conservative in character. The divines of the sixteenth century were concerned chiefly to correct rather than to innovate, and had no intention of elaborating a new theological system, while their successors in the seventeenth century addressed themselves to the task of maintaining the reformed Church of England against attack. As Beveridge says:

> Our first Reformers did not undertake to make a new religion, but only to restore the old: they laid aside nothing but what was lately brought in, at least, in comparison of the old doctrine and discipline, which they retained, as having been taught and practised by the Apostolical and Primitive Church, both in the East and West, before it was corrupted.[2]

By comparison with other reformed bodies, therefore, there are certain features which distinguish the Anglican Church and contribute to the character of Anglicanism.[3]

First, Anglicanism is not derived from or dependent upon the teaching or doctrinal system propounded by any one theologian. To its development many men contributed, some of them eminent and some obscure, but not even Cranmer or Hooker exercised the dominating influence of St. Thomas Aquinas upon Romanism or of Calvin upon Calvinism. Bramhall said:

---

[1] See, in this connexion, E. Graham, 'Non-established Anglicanism', in *Theology* Vol. liii, No. 356 (Feb. 1950), pp. 42-46.

[2] *Works* (Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.), viii, p. 617.

[3] For further consideration of some of the points dealt with in the rest of this paper, see A. M. Ramsey, 'What is Anglican Theology?', in *Theology*, Vol. xlviii, No. 295 (Jan. 1945); A. R. Vidler, 'What is Anglicanism?', in *Theology*, Vol. li, Nos. 336 and 337 (June and July 1948); and P. E. More, 'The Spirit of Anglicanism', in *Anglicanism* (London, 1935), pp. xix ff; to all of which I am indebted.

> . . . we cannot pin our Faith upon the sleeve of any particular man: as one used to say: 'We love no -isms, neither Calvinism, nor Lutheranism, nor Jansenianism, but only one, that we derive from Antioch, that is, Christianism.[1]

Again, Anglicanism has never been formulated in any document such as the Westminster Confession, nor is it regulated and defined by canons or decrees comparable to those of the Council of Trent. The XXXIX Articles are in no sense a confession of faith; they were articles of comprehension framed with reference to a specific historical situation, and designed to bring together conflicting parties in the Church of England on the basis of an agreed statement of doctrine. They certainly show evidence of the Anglican method at work, but their authority has necessarily been affected by the fact that they failed to keep the extremists within the Establishment. Revision at a later date might have produced important alterations. To take another instance, the *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* of 1604 and later codes, such as the Scottish Canons of 1929, are mainly legislative and directive, and in the matter of doctrine add little, if anything, to the Articles. Once more, as against Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Independency, and the Baptists, Anglicanism is not committed to any special emphasis upon one sacrament or system of church government. This needs no qualification in the case of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A., for both adhere to a Catholic view of episcopacy, although in Scotland there are historical and local reasons for the use of the term 'episcopal'.

According to this useful but admittedly negative description, the Anglican Church acknowledges no one man as its founder, clings to no specific and exclusive confession of faith or system of divinity, exalts no particular sacrament or form of ecclesiastical government. Has it then any positive standard to which appeal can be made? Maurice has one important answer to give to this question. He contended that the English reformers, by the providence of God, based the polity of the Anglican Church upon the principle that in bringing man into relation with his Creator, worship, the sacraments, and the signs of Christ's kingdom must take precedence of doctrinal definitions. Thus the Book of Common Prayer is the true expression of the spirit of Anglicanism, while at the same time it forms an acknowledged standard of doctrine and teaching. Maurice illustrates this Anglican principle that man's worship and not his theological formulae bring him to his heavenly Father, by showing what happened at the Restoration:

---

[1] *Works* (Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.), i, p. 38.

> The Westminster Assembly had done their best to establish an uniformity of opinions; that wherein they had left their ministers free, was in their modes of worship. The opposite principle had been the one hitherto recognised in England. . . .

Hence, in 1662,

> The Act of Uniformity in Worship was the substitute for the efforts at a dogmatic uniformity which belonged to the genius of Presbyterianism.[1]

This explains the unique place which the Book of Common Prayer has always held in the estimation of Anglicans.

The Prayer Book is not a collection of rites belonging to a sect, but the living expression of the mind of a Church. It sets forth the catholic faith of antiquity, as declared in the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds. It enjoins a decent order of worship and a firm but reasonable discipline. It is emphatically a book of *common* prayer, by which every churchman is protected against ministerial individualism, eccentricity, or tyranny through the appointment of truly congregational services in which all are allotted and required to bear their proper parts. It points men away from themselves and their systems to an united confession and adoration of the triune God. In all this, and not least in its deliverance of men from the enslavement of sectarianism, the Prayer Book breathes the very spirit of Anglicanism—but it is a spirit caught in church, at the *opus Dei*, and not in the study, poring over the liturgy as if it were a definite formulary.

Here Anglicanism may seem particularly vulnerable. The party divisions which are, to the critical observer, so marked and often so perplexing a feature of Anglican church life, may suggest a tendency to internal sectarianism quite incompatible with the notion of the Prayer Book as an effective instrument and focus of Anglican unity. Such divisions can certainly be disquieting, and may become scandalous and sinful; yet it needs to be recognised that the Anglican dialectic makes them inevitable and even necessary—and that they have not always been by any means disruptive or barren of good results. By permitting diversity of opinion in non-essentials, Anglicanism had encouraged growth and vitality in religion, and has shown that different insights and emphases can, and sometimes must be contained within the Church. To this, the Articles, the Prayer Book, and Anglican church history all bear witness. There have always been persistent 'High-Church' and 'Low-Church' parties, though neither has maintained a consistent tradition, while from time to time other distinctive elements have emerged—among them the seventeenth-century Rationalists and Platonists, the Evangelicals, the Broad Church party, the post-Tractarian Anglo-Catholics, and the Modernists. Positively or negatively, all these have contributed to the development of Anglican thought.

---

[1] *The Kingdom of Christ* (Everyman ed.), ii, pp. 296-7.

Admittedly there are potential dangers in allowing such freedom of theological opinion, as the growth of extremist tendencies within the Anglican Church has shown—though it is, in the long run, even more dangerous to attempt to curb or regiment thought, and suppression of independent inquiry may come near to a denial of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the extremes within the Anglican Church have served, during the last hundred years, a purpose comparable to that served by the extremes outside it during the seventeenth century; through an interior dialectic they have helped to mould the character of Anglicanism. They may also be said to have borne a negative testimony to the Anglican principles that antinomies cannot be resolved simply by the elimination of one of the opposing pairs of truths, and that liturgical is to be preferred to dogmatic uniformity.

So long as this latter principle of a united confession and worship of God was maintained and honoured by obedience to the Book of Common Prayer, diversity of opinion was prevented from degenerating into licence or sectarianism. But it may now be contended that unauthorised liturgical innovation on the one hand, and slovenly disregard for the due order prescribed by the rubrics on the other, have combined to weaken the authority and status of the Prayer Book as *par excellence* the instrument and focus of Anglican unity. Can differences of theological opinion be permitted when the cohesive power of liturgical uniformity has been weakened? This, too, may be felt to constitute a searching challenge to Anglicanism.

In reply, a caveat must first be entered against exaggeration of the alleged liturgical confusion in the Anglican Church. Lawlessness will always attract more notice than the obedience of the many who try to observe the spirit of the Prayer Book and, as nearly as circumstances permit, its letter—for some adaptation is clearly necessary where revision has not accommodated the Book to modern needs. Variations in liturgical practice are admittedly common, though relatively few are such as to cause any serious breach in ritual uniformity, while ceremonial directions (where they exist) often permit some latitude of interpretation—in the case of some, historical research has disclosed an intention at variance with current usage; in the case of others, custom alone is determinative. In spite of a superficial appearance of diversity in worship, the Anglican Church continues to bear unwavering testimony to the important principle that church unity must be centred in *a liturgy*. Ritual and ceremonial deviations from the Prayer Book need not imply disregard for this principle; they may arise from attempts to answer the question, *What liturgy*? *Lex orandi, lex credendi;* where variety in theological opinion is tolerated, continual critical scrutiny of the liturgy is inevitable. Here may be discerned another of those tensions which the Anglican cannot evade. He must be loyal to the Prayer Book by means of which uniformity in worship is made the instrument of church unity, yet he must also understand that if the liturgy is to be indeed a living expression of the mind of the Church, it can never be static—its fixed forms are devised only to be outgrown. Anglicanism therefore implies a dialectic which belongs to the liturgical as well as to the theological sphere, though it has not yet discovered satisfactorily how to allow for disciplined experimentation within the framework of a uniform worship such as that ensured by the general use of a book of common prayer.

The diversity of theological opinion and liturgical practice within the Anglican Church is not, therefore, in itself a cause for disquiet; rather, proceeding as it does from the application to theology and liturgiology of a particular method of thought, it emphasises the ecumenical potentialities of Anglicanism. The extremist tendencies within the Anglican Church, which attract a measure of attention somewhat disproportionate to their importance, result from the abuse or neglect of this method; they are, strictly speaking, aberrations foreign to the spirit of Anglicanism as it is enshrined in the Prayer Book. The Anglican method is to bring everything to the triple test of scripture, tradition, and reason, in conformity with the dictum of Augustine:

> Contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra scripturas nemo Christianus, contra ecclesiam nemo pacificus senserit.[1]

With reference to these three complementary standards the divines of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries worked out the Anglican answer to the charges and claims of Romanism and Calvinism, and they have remained ever since then the guiding principles of Anglicanism. In the Preface to his *Discourse upon the Thirty-nine Articles* (*Ecclesia Anglicana ecclesia catholica*) Beveridge shows how they were applied:

> The method I propounded to myself in this Discourse, was first to shew that each Article for the sum and substance of it is grounded upon the scriptures, so that if it be not expressly contained in them, howsoever it may by good and undeniable consequence be deduced from them. Having shewn it to be grounded upon the scriptures, I usually prove it to be consonant to right reason too, even such a truth, that though scripture did not, reason itself would command us to believe it. And lastly, for the further confirmation of it, I still shew each Article to be believed and acknowledged for a truth by the Fathers of the primitive church. . . .[2]

Only in treating of Article XVII (*Of Predestination and Election*) does he depart from this procedure—and even then he excludes an appeal to reason on the rational ground that 'this mystery of mysteries' must necessarily be 'infinitely above man's apprehension'.[3] It does not fall within the scope of this paper to demonstrate the application of this method from the writings of the Reformation and Caroline divines, but something ought to be said about the view of scripture, tradition, and reason which Anglican theology implies.

---

[1] *de Trin.* iv. 6 (*Migne*, *Patr. Lat.*, xlii. col. 895).
[2] *Works* (Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.), vii, p. x.
[3] ibid, pp. 343-4.

First, as to scripture: it is clear that Anglicanism excludes both literalistic fundamentalism and private interpretation. Pointing out that 'The Scripture is not in the words, but in the sense; not in the superficies, but in the marrow', Bramhall explains how and by whom the Bible ought to be interpreted:

> Many helps are requisite to a right interpreter: as, to know the right analogy of faith, and to regulate all his expositions by it, which every one cannot comprehend; to compare place with place, and text with text, which every one cannot perform; to understand the coherence of the antecedents with the consequents, which all men are not capable of; to know the idiotisms of that language wherein the Scriptures were written, which few attain unto; 'to draw down the line of faith and seeds of doctrine from those purer Churches of the primitive times', as Tertullian adviseth; and 'from the conduit-head of Apostolical tradition to direct the pipe to our times', as St. Cyprian doth exhort and St. Austin approve: which counsel we readily embrace. . . . as we make the Scriptures the rule of faith . . . so we do not ascribe to every one the same degree of judgment. To private men, we yield only a judgment of discretion. . . . To the pastors of the Church we give a judgment of direction; and to the chief pastors or Bishops, a judgment of jurisdiction. . . .[1]

Thus the principles of Biblical interpretation are themselves determined by reason, and include an appeal to tradition. This exegetical method has ensured an open-mindedness which has enabled the Anglican Church to maintain the paramount authority of scripture while making many valuable contributions to Biblical studies, and assimilating the assured results of Biblical criticism. Moreover, as Professor Ramsey has pointed out,[2] this method holds a hope of reconciliation between the liberal view, with its emphasis upon the 'human nature' of scripture, and the 'new' theological view, with its tendency to overstress the divine nature of scripture. Is there not need, he asks,

> . . . for a treatment of Biblical questions, an exposition of Biblical themes, an assessment of Biblical authority which holds in view the Two Natures of the Bible? And is this not a task akin to that which Hooker performed in a different though cognate field?

By 'tradition' the Reformers and the Carolines understood the doctrine of the 'undivided' Church of the first five centuries, as embodied in the creeds, formulated by conciliar legislation, and expounded in the writings of the Fathers, together with what Hooker describes as

---

[1] *Works* (Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.), v, pp. 269-270.

[2] op. cit., p. 5.

> . . . ordinances made in the prime of Christian religion, established with that authority which Christ hath left to his Church for matters indifferent, and in that consideration requisite to be observed, till like authority see just and reasonable cause to alter them. So that traditions ecclesiastical are not rudely and in gross to be shaken off, because the inventors of them were men.[1]

Yet the traditions of the Church and the teachings of the Fathers must always be judged by their conformity to the inward sense of scripture, as determined by the principles of rational exegesis.

To this reverence for antiquity which is so marked a feature of Anglican thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Tractarians added an appeal to the particular tradition in which they themselves stood—a tradition which they held to be embodied in the works of Hooker and of the theologians of the Caroline period who succeeded him. Like the Anglican Fathers, however, the Oxford divines tended to regard their authorities as sources for proof-texts rather than as witnesses to a living and growing tradition. The result was a static view of history which left too little room for development, and a belief that any point in controversy could be decided by a sufficiently impressive *catena* of testimonies such as those set forth in some of the *Tracts for the Times.*[2] Clearly, this selective view of tradition is vulnerable at more than one point, but it is not a view to which Anglicanism is committed by its method. The Anglican appeal to tradition is, properly, an appeal to history and Christian experience, based on the conviction that the Holy Spirit is indeed abroad and at work in the Church. Anglicanism insists that the past can neither be ignored, nor its evidence manipulated in the interest of any *a priori* theory of development. The facts of history must first (so far as that is possible) be ascertained, and then studied, according to the principles of an impartial and scientific historical discipline. Hence Anglicanism repudiates both the Romanist and the extreme Protestant views of history as lacking in realism, and as failing to do justice to the evident complexity of the historical pattern. Against the one, it asserts that what is not attested by historical proof cannot be accepted as historical fact, simply on grounds of congruity or the implicit warrant of ecclesiastical tradition. Against the other, it insists that account must be taken of historical development and continuity; whether desirable or not, a return to New Testament conditions (for instance) is impossible, even supposing that those conditions could be ascertained beyond all doubt. Anglicanism, therefore, affirms the Reformation, not as a desperate attempt to obliterate the history of fifteen centuries in order to resuscitate a primitive ecclesiastical ideal, but as a significant stage in the on-going life of the Church and a creative movement of the Spirit. Nothing is more integral to the spirit of Anglicanism than this grasp of the meaning of history, and this submission to the logic of history.

---

[1] *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxv. 2 (*Works* [Oxford, 1888], ii, p. 318.)

[2] See, e.g., Nos. 74, 76, 78, and 81.

Anglicanism appeals, thirdly, to reason—though it must be clearly understood that this has nothing to do with what is now known as 'rationalism'. The most notable exponents of this principle are the Rationalists and the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century, and their message is particularly relevant to our own time. One of their principle affirmations was that the rational spirit in man is 'the candle of the Lord',[1] lit by God and lighting man to God. Thus Chillingworth insists that every man's religion must be grounded on rational conviction:

> For my part [he says], I am certain that God hath given us our reason, to discern between truth and falsehood; and he that makes not this use of it, but believes things he knows not why; I say, it is by chance that he believes the truth, and not by choice; and that I cannot but fear that God will not accept of this *sacrifice of fools*.[2]

To exalt reason thus does not, of course, mean to advocate unlimited liberty of private belief; but it does mean that on whatever authority a man accepts his religion, he must have good reason for doing so—and, in the words of Henry More, the special prerogative of Christianity is that, above all other faiths, 'it dares to appeal unto reason'.[3]

Particularly significant, however, is the characteristic temper exhibited by the Rationalists and Platonists—their reasonableness and moderation; their intellectual fearlessness combined with reverence, caution, and freedom from arrogant dogmatism; their care to discern between things essential and things indifferent in matters of faith. In an age of religious strife and bitter antagonisms they stood for toleration, liberty of conscience, and Christian humility and charity. These are all qualities inseparable from the true spirit of Anglicanism, though it must freely be admitted that they have not always found expression in Anglican history and controversy. Nonetheless, in departing from the ideal which they represent, Anglicanism denies itself, as it does also when it attempts to restrict legitimate rational enquiry and, in the words of Archbishop Frederick Temple, to 'prescribe the conclusions' in such a way as to 'preclude the study'.

---

[1] Prov. xx. 27

[2] W. Chillingworth, *Works* (Oxford, 1838), i, pp. 237-8.

[3] See J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology . . . in England in the Seventeenth Century*, ii, p. 354.

The proper method of Anglicanism is to apply to every question these three standards of scripture, tradition, and reason. They are not, and cannot be, fixed and unalterable standards. Biblical criticism has resulted in a new conception of the meaning and authority of scripture, while the discovery of lost or unknown writings, and the development of a scientific approach to historical investigation, have meant a different assessment of Christian tradition. Anglicanism, with its spirit of rational inquiry and sound, sober scholarship has done much to bring about these changes. Because of its essential open-mindedness, the Anglican Church is not so fettered to its past or its formularies that it can neither advance to the affirmation of new and proved insights, nor admit error in non-essentials; it can take advantage of fresh discoveries and revelations of the truth. Above all, Anglicanism is adventurous and on-going, afraid neither to ask questions nor to hear the answers—though it always brings those answers to the test of its proper method, by which they must ultimately stand or fall. Hence the meaning of Anglicanism must be sought, not in what the divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries said, but in the method whereby they reached their conclusions. Their opinions may often carry great weight, but can never be regarded as infallible; they must always be tested and continually re-examined by the standards according to which they were first framed. This demands in a pre-eminent degree that reverence for sound learning which has always been one of the most distinctive features of the Anglican Church, and which once earned for its clergy the epithet *stupor mundi*.

Anglicanism, then, is not a doctrinal or ecclesiastical system, nor is it essentially dependent in any way upon the local or temporal circumstances of its origin. It is a theological method, a direction of thought, a way of Christian life, which found its most notable expression in the teaching, practice, and devotion of the Anglican Church during the seventeenth century. But the Anglican Church does not always and everywhere reflect the spirit of Anglicanism. It has sometimes to pay, and must always be prepared to pay, the price of what More calls 'pragmatism', or the 'ultimate law of Anglicanism'.[1] Also, it can never escape the consequences of its deep involvement in the dialectic of history, an involvement from which certain systems of theology can extricate themselves because of basic presuppositions which take no account of the reality and inescapability of history. Nevertheless, in spite of failures and disruptive influences, the Anglican Church has never ceased to bear witness to the principles of Anglicanism, and has never wholly denied its true genius and vocation.

In the light of this analysis it will be clear that although Anglicanism is commonly described, in Professor Manson's words, as a 'synthesis' or 'compromise', those terms need some qualification. Inevitably the Anglican method sometimes produces a synthesis or compromise, but that is not its object; it seeks rather to recognise antinomies and to give full weight to the double polarity of truth. Anglicanism is never comfortable or temporising (which is often what 'compromise' implies), but always dynamic and dangerous; its theology, as Doctor Vidler has well said, is a theology

> . . . not of fog or haze, but of thunder and lightning; a theology which comes down off the fence, but not always on the same side, and which certainly does not fall into a copy-book place on a party line. It is a theology, of which you can never feel that you know just what it is going to do or say next—which is what I always do feel both about the theologies of a party and about the theology of moderation.[2]

But for all this, there is nothing capricious or arbitrary about Anglicanism; it is not drifting rudderless upon the theological ocean, at the mercy of every 'blast of vain doctrine'. It is firmly anchored to the scriptures, the creeds, and the sacraments of the Gospel; yet, true to its principles, it also endeavours to hold itself sensitive to the movement and the voice of the Holy Spirit ('the wind bloweth where it listeth') as he seeks to lead the Church into all the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

---

[1] op. cit., pp. xxxii ff.

[2] op. cit., *Theology*, No. 337, p. 245.

The ecumenical significance of Anglicanism, therefore, lies in its distinctive method of approaching and dealing with theological problems, and not in its being a *via media* as such. It is not narrowly denominational, for there are many outside the pale of the Anglican Church who show how deeply, if unconsciously, they share its spirit. That Church is not simply a convenient common meeting-place for those who would otherwise never come together; still less is it a 'bridge' (as it has sometimes been described), for bridges only exist to be crossed. Nor is Anglicanism a reunion scheme offered for the acceptance of all because it contains certain features generally acceptable, and others which might be the subject of mutual concession or compromise. It is primarily a way of reconciliation commended by Anglicans to a divided Church, because they believe that the surest hope of healing the differences between Christians lies in the patient application of its principles and method.

One point perhaps needs brief mention in conclusion. I shall probably be reminded that non-Anglicans have been asked to 'take into their systems', not a method, but Episcopacy, and that the Anglican Church holds doctrines such as those of the Episcopate, Apostolical Succession, and the Sacraments, which are not acceptable to many with whom it seeks reunion. Questions arise here which are outside the scope of this paper, but this much, at least, may be said. The Anglican Church is committed in principle to Episcopacy, for example, because scripture and tradition, examined candidly and interpreted rationally and without partiality, show that the Episcopate is in some way integral to the constitution of the Church. But the actual form of this essential ministry can only be ascertained by the application of the theological method typical of Anglicanism. This seems to me to be implied in the term 'Historic Episcopate', to which exception has often been taken on the ground that Episcopacy has assumed different forms during the course of its history. By taking its stand on the Historic Episcopate, the Anglican Church affirms the particular form of Episcopacy which it now possesses (a form which exhibits certain variations in non-essentials, such as methods of appointment), believing it to have evolved naturally under the guidance of the Holy Spirit as a continuous and valid historical institution. At the same time, it subjects both that form of Episcopacy and the historical process by which it evolved to continual scrutiny, by testing them against the standards of Anglicanism—scripture, tradition, and reason. And it is by this same method that Anglicans invite non-Anglicans to consider Episcopacy—and the other matters at present in controversy between them—in the conviction that as both do so in the true spirit of Anglicanism, they will begin to discern together the shape of what Professor Manson calls 'the Fulness of the Church to be'.

THE TERM 'LIFE' IN SYRIAC THEOLOGY

by Dr A. F. J. KLIJN

In 1899 Burkitt posed a question to which no answer has yet been given. It was as follows: 'It is still more surprising and instructive to find that "salvation" is identified by the Syriac usage with "life". *Σωτήρ* is Mahyânâ, "Life-giver", and "to be saved" is "to live". This is the more remarkable, as Syriac has several words meaning "to deliver", "to protect" and "to be safe and sound". May we not therefore believe that this identification of "salvation" and "life" is the genuine Aramaic usage, and that the Greek Gospels have in this instance introduced a distinction which was not made by Christ and his Aramaic-speaking disciples?'[1] If Burkitt is right, it is evident that quite a new light is thrown on a number of instances in the NT where the word *σῴζω* occurs. This can be seen at once as one thinks of the somewhat negative 'Saviour' becoming the more positive 'Life-giver'. Theologically also, however, there is a difference in meaning, which Burkitt remarked on a few years later. 'The use of *ḥajē*, *life*, to render *σωτηρία* and *σωτήριον*, instead of some word meaning "deliverance", together with the corresponding equivalent verb *ḥj*' and *σῴζεσθαι* belongs rather to theology and philosophy than to linguistics.'[2]

While Old Testament scholars are becoming more and more aware of the importance of the word 'life' in the theology of the OT, a matter we shall have to turn to presently, New Testament scholars have hardly touched the subject. In 1927, Canney pointed once again to the peculiar Syriac usage in the Syriac Biblical translations of *σῴζω*, but he gave only a few examples. There was nothing like a systematic investigation.[3]

Here we shall trace how and where the phenomenon occurs, and then try to investigate the matter from a theological point of view.

---

[1] F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1899, p. 22.
[2] F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, Cambridge 1904, vol. I, p. 81.
[3] M. A. Canney, *The Meaning of Salvation*, in: *Theology* XV 1927, pp. 61-63.

The phenomenon is most striking in the Old Syriac text of the NT. In *Syr. s and c*, where ever they are extant σῴζω is translated throughout by *ḥj'*, σωτήρ by *maḥjana* and σωτηρία by *ḥajē*. There is only one exception: Matt. 9.21 where σωθήσομαι is translated by *m*^{e}*ḥasja*' '*ana*' in *Syr. s*(*c*)*p*. The parallel passage in *Syr. p*, however, (*Syr. sc* are not extant) has *ḥajē*' '*ana*'. It is not clear whether this usage left traces in Mark 5.23: ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ which is rendered in the Old Syriac by *w*^{e}*tiḥe*,[1] or whether this is only an assimilation to the parallel passage in Matt. 9.18. The conclusion for the Old Syriac versions is thus that 'to be saved', 'to be healed' and 'to live' are identical terms.

In the *Peshitto* we notice a change. Here we find forms of *prq* also in use: Matt. 14.30, 27.49, Luke 1.69 and 71 and 2.11.[2] Then we find the Ethpeel of *ḥlm* in Mark 5.23 and John 11.12 and the Ethpeel of '^{a}*si* Matt. 9.21, Mark 6.56 and Luke 8.36. The last two words mean 'to heal'. Finally the word *paṣi*, 'to deliver', is used in Matt. 8.25, 27.40 and Mark 15.30. This is obviously a swing in the direction of the Greek usage; *ḥj'* is no longer used to translate 'to save' from a dangerous situation (Peter on the water, Jesus on the cross) or 'to heal'. It is, however, still used in the spiritual sphere.

Before going to the later versions, we shall first try to see what occurs in what is probably the oldest of the Syriac versions. The Diatessaron is lost in its original form, and one has to go to the Armenian version of Ephrem's commentary on it and to its medieval Dutch translations. A number of Syriasms seem to have been left in the Dutch text.[3] Usually we find 'behouden' (to save), sometimes 'ghenesen' (to heal) in John 11.12, Mark 5.28 and Luke 8.50, sometimes 'ghesont maeken' (to cure) in Luke 7.50 and 17.19, or 'helpen' (to help) in Matt. 14.30, but also 'leven' (to live) in Mark 5.23 = Matt. 9.18, Luke 7.50 (in the Stuttgart MS.) and Matt. 8.25. These renderings are probably not due to later Syriac usage (cf. the Peshitto with '^{a}*si*, etc.). They may go back to the Dutch translator or to his Latin copy. Proof of this suggestion is to be found in Luke 8.50

---

[1] Cf. *c e Sah.* and *Eth.*

[2] *prq* is the translation of the *jsh*^{c} in the Peshitto OT. Note therefore the use of it in the Aramaizing first chapters of Luke.

[3] Cf. D. Plooy, C. A. Phillips and A. H. A. Bakker (since 1938), *The Liège Diatessaron*, in: *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, afd. Letterkunde, n.R., Part XXXI: I, 1929; II, 1931; III, 1933; IV, 1935; V, 1938.

where the Liège Diat. has 'ghenesen', but the Stuttgart MS. has 'leven'. But that in many of these cases we are not dealing with the original text can be seen by reference to Moesinger's translation of the Armenian text. Ephrem comments on Matt. 17.42: *ἄλλους ἔσωσεν ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι.* The text itself is quoted as: *alios salvos fecit se ipsum non potest salvum facere*, but the commentary shows clearly that Ephrem started from a text which read: *alios vivificavit se ipsum non potest vivificare.*[1]

Aphraates mainly using the Diatessaron, in all his quotations from the NT, shows the Old Syriac rendering of σῴζω by *ḥj*'.[2] Thus though we cannot speak conclusively we may say that the Diatessaron translated σῴζω by *ḥj*'.

We now turn to the later versions and first to the *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary.* It is still not settled whether this translation was made outside Palestine (so Burkitt[3]) or inside (so Lagrange[4]). It seems to go back to a Greek original. Since, however, M. Black discovered Diatessaron-readings in this text,[5] we may assume that it shows traces of some very old texts. There are only a few passages where σῴζω occurs in the Greek NT that are not extant in *Pal. Lect.* In all surviving cases we find that *ḥj*' is used with the exception of two. These are Mark 16.16 (*mishtauzebh*) and Luke 13.23 (*mishtauz*ᵉ*bhin*).

When we turn to the Philoxenian (508) we must bear in mind that it was specially required to show as slavish a translation as possible. No wonder that here we find *prq* and *shauzebh* both as renderings of σῴζω.

It is impossible to go into the problem of the Armenian text. That it goes back to a Greek original is obvious. Syriac influence, however, cannot be denied.[6] It is therefore interesting to note that there are a number of places where the word 'to live' is used instead of that for 'to save' (Matt. 10.22, 16.25,

---

[1] G. Moesinger, *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a S. Ephraemo Doctore Syro*, Venetiis 1876, pp. 249 and 250.

[2] Mark 16.16 (Dem. 1.17), Luke 3.6 (Dem. 16.7), 19.9 (Dem. 20.17), John 10.9 (Dem. 4.4) and Phil. 2.12 (Dem. 23.2).

[3] F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Palestinian Literature*, in: *Journ. of Theol. St.* II, 1901, pp. 174-183.

[4] M. J. Lagrange, *l'Origine de la Version Syro-Palestinienne des Évangiles*, in: *Rev. Bibl.* XXXIV, 1925, pp. 481-504.

[5] M. Black, *The Palestinian Syriac Gospels and the Diatessaron*, in: *Oriens Chr.* 3. S., 14. B., 1. H., 1939, pp. 101-111.

[6] S. Lyonnet, *La Première Version Arménienne des Évangiles*, in: *Rev. Bibl.* XLVII, 1938, pp. 355-382.

18.11, 24.13, Mark 5.34, 10.52, 13.13, 16.16, Luke 8.48 and 50, 9.56, 7.50, 17.19, 18.42, 19.10, John 10.9).

This completes the linguistic evidence as far as the NT is concerned. The historical development is clear. In the oldest versions σῴζω is translated by *ḥj'* only. In the Peshitto this presented difficulties in passages where it was a matter of saving from physically difficult situations. Finally the Philoxenian comes into complete agreement with the Greek text.[1]

Before passing to the theological background, we must first see how matters stand in Aramaic usage prior to the Syriac NT: the Peshitto of the OT and the Targums.

The Hebrew OT knows a number of words meaning 'to save': *plṭ*, *shezibh* and *jsh*^{c}. The LXX translated these quite regularly by σῴζω. The Targums also show a variety of words: *prq* especially is popular, but *shezibh* and *plṭ* are also found. The Peshitto OT has *prq*, *shauzebh*, *plṭ* and *paṣi*. There are no irregularities, but that is to be expected. On this question it is clearly important to see how the Hebrew word *ḥjh* fares. If Burkitt is right in suggesting that in a great many cases in the NT σῴζω goes back to an Aramaic *ḥjh*, it is not unimportant to see whether the LXX sets an example in this usage. Now the LXX translates *ḥjh* by forms of ζάω. There are only two instances where σῴζω translates *ḥjh*. These are to be found in Gen. 47.25 and Ezek. 33.12.[2] With regard to the Targums and the Peshitto we see that the verb *ḥjh* is translated by *qum* throughout in the Targum of Onkelos[3] (though *ḥajjah* is rendered by *ḥaj*^{e}*tha* and by *ḥj'* in the Peshitto).

Next we must check the passages in the NT where σῴζω occurs which are quotations from the OT. These are Luke 1.47 (Hab. 3.18), Luke 2.30 (Isa. 40.5 and 52.10), Acts 2.21 (= Rom. 10.13 from Joel 3.5), Acts 13.47 (Isa. 49.6), Rom. 9.27 (Isa. 10.22), 1 Thess. 5.8 (Isa. 59.17), Phil. 1.19 (Job 13.16), Heb. 5.9 (Isa. 45.17). The Massoretic text uses *jsh*^{c} and *plṭ*

---

[1] It is impossible to say: '*ḥajē* also im Gegensatz zum hebräischen etwas rein Geistiges', and *ḥlm* and '^{a}*si* are only used 'vom rein physischen "gesund werden" ' (O. Klein, *Syr.-Griech. Wörterbuch zu den vier kanon. Evangelien*, in: *Beihefte zur Zeitschr. für die A. T. Wissenschaft*. 28, Giessen 1926, p. 13). This might be true for the Peshitto, but is not in agreement with the Old-Syriac evidence.

[2] Cf. the Cyprian bilingual Inscription for the goddess Anat: ענת עז חים, *'Αθηνᾶ Σωτῆρα Νίκη* from about the time of Ptolemy I (367/6-283/2) in: *Corpus Inscriptium Semiticarum*, Parisiis 1881, Tom. 1.95.

[3] As far as the Palestinian Targum is left (P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Stuttgart, 1930, p. 30) we see the same in Gen. 6.19 and 20.

(and *shubh* in Isa. 10.22), the Peshitto OT *prq* and *paṣi*, and the Targum *prq* and *shezibh* quite regularly. The Old Syriac and the Peshitto NT, however, have *ḥj'* with two exceptions. These are found in Acts 28.28 (Ps. 67.3) and Eph. 6.17 (Isa. 59.17) where in both cases the Peshitto has *purqana* for τὸ σωτήριον. This is instructive for with regard to the Peshitto it proves that the actual OT text had no influence at all on the quotation. Where the Greek NT quotes Isa. 59.17 in 1 Thess. 5.8 using σωτηρία, the Peshitto, quite regularly, has *dᵉḥajē*, but where the same quotation occurs in Eph. 6.17 using σωτήριον it has *purqana* just as in Acts 28.28.

Finally we must shortly deal with the word *qum* having sometimes the same significance as *ḥjh*. We have already seen that the Targum drives out *ḥjh* in favour of *qum*. In Hosea 6.1 we see the word alongside *ḥjh* in a 'vollkommen synonymen Parallelismus, wie er nach dem Parallelismus in vs. 1 von "heilen" und "verbinden" zu erwarten ist'.[1] Thus it is only to be expected that in Rabbinic literature, as in the Syriac NT *tᵉqumah* occurs for resurrection alongside *'aḥajuth* and *tᵉḥijjah* and *qᵉjamta* alongside *nuḥama*, with no difference in meaning at all. Each could be translated 'returning to life', 'revival'. Thus the word ἀναβιόω and ἀναβίωσις render the Aramaic *tᵉqumah* much better than ἀνάστασις.[2] Another word with the same significance as *ḥjh* is *ᶜmd*. It is used as such in Ezek. 37.10. This word, however, slowly disappears and is replaced by *qum* in the Targums and the Peshitto. The question whether the original idea 'to rise', 'to return to life' is preserved in the Syriac word for 'to baptise' (*ᶜmd*) ought probably, when seen in relation to the Mandaean parallel (*q'jjm*)[3] to be answered in the affirmative.[4]

---

[1] W. W. Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun*, Leipzig, 1911, p. 404.

[2] Cf. ἀναβιώσας in II Clem. 19.4.

[3] M. Lidzbarski, *Mandäische Liturgien*, in: *Abhandl. der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen*, phil. hist. Kl., n. F., Bd XVII, 1, p. XXIII.

[4] The dictionaries are probably wrong in giving the first meaning of *ᶜmd* as 'to dive', etc. In that case it would be similar to the Greek βαπτίζω 'to dip', etc. and then later 'to baptise'. Here the order is probably the reverse: first 'to stand' and 'to baptise', later becoming 'to dip' and 'to plunge' (cf. Matt. 14.20, Luke 16.24, John 13.26), for in this case we have an explanation of the different meaning of *ᶜmd* but not in the other. To see any relation between *qᵉyama* and the puzzling expression *bᵉnai qᵉjama*, as D. Plooy does in *Novum Testamentum Regnum Aeternum*, Amsterdam, 1932, may be tempting, but it is probably not justifiable. In this case *qᵉjama* is clearly derived from *qum* which can only mean 'covenant', while 'children of the Resurrection' has to be *bᵉnajja daqᵉjamta* (cf. Luke 20.36), a derivation from *qᵉjama*.

The results of this inquiry into the linguistic background have not given us enough data for a positive answer to the question put at the beginning. Neither the LXX nor the Peshitto nor the Targums shows any tendency to vary the significance of the words. We see that the LXX faithfully translates the Hebrew words and that the Peshitto OT shows no tendency to prefer the word 'to live' to 'to save'. The OT quotations in the NT have probably no great bearing on the subject since they are apparently translated from the Greek NT without reference to the OT, in any case as far as the Peshitto is concerned. At the same time, however, we have seen that two very important words, viz. resurrection and baptism are probably derived from words originally meaning 'to live'. Nevertheless, we have to agree with Burkitt that we cannot approach the matter linguistically. It seems to be a purely theological problem.

Let us now approach the matter from a theological point of view. It is generally accepted that Christianity started in Syria within a Jewish community.[1] If one wanted to specify the most important thing the Jews believed they had received from God, it would undoubtedly be 'life'. 'Zunächst ist "Leben" —das höchste und willkommenste Gut, das man sich von Jahwe erbitten and das Jahwe als Lohn geben kann.'[2] We may take this as the starting point for our inquiry. Now this 'life' must reach certain standards. It must be a life in which the commandments of the law are fulfilled (Deut. 32.47, 30.16) and for those who have not yet it, a conversion is necessary (Ezek. 18.32, 32.11). This 'life' includes happiness: in Mal. 2.5 we see that 'life' and 'peace' are identical terms.[3] The life given by God is not the natural life as it appears everywhere. Indeed this kind of life is actually death. It is also important to note that real life includes both body and soul. Because 'man is conceived, not so much in dual fashion as "body" and "soul", but synthetically as a unit of vital power or (in current terminology) as psycho-physical organism',[1] to be happy is identical with to be healthy. That is why to be ill is a form of death, and recovery is coming to life again.[2] When the King of Syria sends a letter to the King of Israel concerning his servant Naaman who is ill, the King of Israel says: 'Am I God, to kill and to make alive?' (2 Kings 5.7). It is noteworthy in this connexion that the Hebrew has no proper word for 'to heal'. 'Wie für "genesen" kein anderes Wort als *ḥjh* "leben" so hat das Alte Testament auch für "Gesundheit" kein anderes als *ḥajjim* "Leben".'[3] Baudissin has shown that this is true not only of Hebrew, but of other Semitic languages like those of the Ethiopians, Assyrians, Babylonians and Phoenicians.[4]

---

[1] P. E. Kahle, *The Kairo Geniza*, *The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1941*, London, 1947, pp. 188-189.

[2] L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des Lebens im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient*, Münster 1926, p. 3. Cf. *Theol. Wörterbuch* II, p. 844 (v. Rad) and G. v. Rad, '*Gerechigkeit*' *und* '*Leben*' *in der Kultsprache der Psalmen*, in: *Festschrift für A. Bertholet*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 418-437, p. 426 (about 'life'): 'es wurde Israel vom Kultus aus zugesprochen'.

[3] Cf. W. W. Baudissin, *Alttestamentliches hajjīm*, '*Leben*' *in der Bedeutung von* '*Glück*', in: *Festschr. für Ed. Sachau*, Berlin 1915, pp. 142-168.

From all this it is evident what important a part the word 'life' played in Semitic thought. It covers a much wider area than in Greek. Where the Greek has to make a distinction between 'to heal', 'to save' and 'to bring to life' or between 'to rise', 'to stand' and 'to live' the Syriac and other languages use only one word.[5]

The influence of all this is not only to be seen in the Old Syriac text, but also in the oldest theological writings in Syria. In the probably oldest one, the Odes of Solomon, we notice forms of *ḥj'* and *prq* together, but obviously as synonyms.[6] Also in the liturgical homilies of Narsai with a very old background we see what an important part is played by the idea 'life' in relation to Baptism.[7] From an article by M. A. Canney one gathers how frequently 'life' in all its forms occurs in the Acts of Thomas.[1] Finally without assigning it a very early date, one can see that in the Doctrine of Addai 'life' is considered to be a fundamental Christian idea.[2]

---

[1] A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, Cardiff, 1949, p. 88.

[2] J. Pedersen, *Israel its Life and Culture*, London-Copenhagen, 1926, p. 183.

[3] W. W. Baudissin, *Adonis*—, p. 396.

[4] Baudissin, *Adonis* —, pp. 397-402. See especially for the Babylonian Conception: F. Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und Alttestamentlischer Auferstehungsglauben*, Würzburg 1926, pp. 17-24, about Israel pp. 129-138. W. Wagner, *Über ΣΩΖΕΙΝ und seine Derivata im NT*, in: *Z.N.W.* VI, 1905, pp. 205-235, remarked that 'to save'= 'to come to life' in the NT. His inquiries, however, split up into a part dealing with a 'natural' death (sickness, etc.) and a spiritual one (sin). This is not in agreement with the Semitic background of the Gospels.

[5] Cf. John 11.25: ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή in Syr s: *'^{a}na q^{e}jamta 'ana* (with P45 a l Cypr.).

[6] R. Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, Manchester, 1920, 2 vol., see: VIII, 22; XVII, 14; XXVI, 9; XXXIV, 6; XXXVIII, 3 and 6; XL, 5-6.

[7] R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, in: *Texts and St.* vol. VIII, 1909, see Hom. XXII and XXI.

That Syriac Theology did not retain these ideas of 'life', but assimilated them to the Greek conception is to be seen not only in the difference of usage in the Peshitto NT, but also in later literature, where 'life' is very often envisaged as only really beginning after death.[3] This however, is not important for our present subject.

Having seen that the use of *ḥj'* for *σῴζω* is in complete agreement with the theology of the OT with its much wider meaning attached to it we have not yet solved the problem whether we are here closer to the original words of Jesus. If Christianity was brought to the Syriac-speaking world after the introduction of the Greek Gospels it is very difficult to understand how it came to render two distinct ideas by one word. This had not happened in the Peshitto OT, why should it happen in the NT? Therefore we may say that the 'life-theology' antedates the introduction of the Greek Gospels or a Syriac translation of them. Is Jesus himself responsible for the use of 'life' in place of 'salvation'? If this is true we have no explanation why the Greek Gospels altered this usage. We did not notice any tendency like this in the LXX, neither is there any theological explanation of such an alteration. In that case the only explanation left is that this usage is due to a particular group within the church—a group for which Christ was in the first place the Giver of Life. This group might easily have been a Jewish-Christian one. This is also in agreement with the Jewish background of the Syriac Church. When later the Gospels arrived in the Syriac-speaking world with their distinctions, theology was stronger than linguistics and managed to preserve the original conception.

---

[1] M. A. Canney, *Life-Symbols in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, in: *Oriens* I, 1926, pp. 23-24.

[2] G. Phillips, *The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle*, London 1876. A favourite expression is 'to sow the word of life'. This is found in *The Doctrine* on p. 8, in the *Acts of Thomas* on p. 176 and in the *Hom. of Narsai* on pp. 33, 45, and 51.

[3] Cf. again the *Doctrine of Addai*, p. 22: '. . . that for which our Lord came into the world was altogether to teach and show that at the end of created things is a resurrection for all men'. See also Ephrem's *Carmina Nisibena*, 43-51 and Aphraates' *Dem.* VIII.

ST. MARK 16.1-8

by THE REV. C. E. B. CRANFIELD

PART II

1. THE EMPTY TOMB

THE first question that must be considered is the *historical* one: *Was* the tomb empty? In a very useful chapter entitled 'History and Criticism' Professor A. M. Ramsey discusses 'some of the types of conclusion reached by those who have applied the methods of critical science to the narratives of the Resurrection'.[1] He mentions first the *subjective-vision theory*, according to which 'the appearances of Jesus recorded in the Gospels were simply visions generated by the imaginations of the disciples out of an intense state of emotion or expectancy'. Some who have held this view have combined with it a belief in the survival of Jesus' soul. As Professor Ramsey points out, there are obvious difficulties in the way of accepting this theory—particularly the fact that the disciples' slowness to believe is a marked feature of the narratives. He then mentions the 'telegram from heaven' or what we might call the *objective-vision theory* (Theodor Keim, B. H. Streeter), according to which 'the residuum of fact behind the narratives consists not in visions generated by the disciples but in visions imparted by God Himself, so as to assure the disciples that Jesus was alive. . . .'

How then is the evidence of the empty tomb to be disposed of? We saw above that the explanation that the narrative of the discovery of the empty tomb is a late creation of the Church, of which the tradition repeated in 1 Cor. 15 does not know, is unconvincing.[2] If then we accept the view that the belief that the tomb was empty goes back to within a few days of the Crucifixion, how are we to account for it? Streeter rejected the idea that the body of Jesus was raised; but he thought that the evidence for the tomb's being empty was convincing. His explanation was that some unknown person had removed the body. Kirsopp Lake, on the other hand, thought that the women went by mistake to the wrong tomb (a not very likely hypothesis quite apart from Mark 15.47) and a young man directed them to the right one with the words, 'He is not here: behold the place where they laid him'. The word *ἠγέρθη* ('He is risen') Lake regarded as a later addition.[1]

---

[1] *The Resurrection of Christ*, pp. 45-57.

[2] Part I, p. 294. Cf. E. Stauffer, *Die Theologie des NTs*, p. 115 and also notes 431, 432, on p. 269. In note 432 he argues that Rom. 6.4 and Col. 2.12 imply the empty tomb.

An obvious difficulty of both these explanations is that, if the empty tomb played any part in, or was implied by, the earliest preaching, one would have expected the truth to have emerged. Why did not the unknown person confess? Why did not the young man explain? Both explanations seem to imply that someone deceptively kept silence. Anyway, why did not the authorities take steps to find the body and produce it and thus destroy what they regarded as a dangerous movement? The same applies, if there was a deliberate piece of deceit on the part of the disciples—if they stole the body. Of course, there would be a chance of their successfully concealing it, but not a very big chance, one would think. Against this suggestion there is also the objection that what we know of the early history of the Church hardly seems to fit in with the hypothesis that it was founded upon a deliberate deception by the disciples.

Professor Ramsey emphasises a point that needs emphasising—that those who disbelieve in the empty tomb are no more free from presuppositions than are those who believe in it. A great deal more could, of course, be said on the historical question; but perhaps enough has been said for our present purpose. Believing that the right tomb *was* empty (and not because human hands had removed the body), we proceed to ask the further question:

What are the implications of the Empty Tomb? The main thing that must be said here is something very obvious, namely that the New Testament means precisely the *resurrection* of Jesus, not the survival of His soul. In two brilliant chapters of historical survey in his book *And the Life Everlasting* Professor John

---

[1] In the text the words *οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε · ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν* coming after *ἠγέρθη* stress the *evidence* of the empty tomb.

Baillie has drawn attention to a certain parallelism between the historical backgrounds of the Hebrew belief in resurrection and the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul.[1] Both the pre-Homeric Greeks and the pre-Mosaic Hebrews, it would seem, shared in the common animism of primitive man, according to which the souls or shades of the dead continue to live in the grave or in a common grave-place (Erebus, Sheol) and, although this is a dim and shadowy existence, to possess 'a real measure of conscious and active life, with free movement and memory and interest in the earthly fortunes of their descendants as well as some power to influence these fortunes'.[2] With this belief went the worship of the dead by the living. But among both the Greeks and the Hebrews this stage of belief gave way to another, in which the worship of the dead was given up and the souls or shades of the dead were regarded 'as having no proper conscious life at all, lacking both memory of the past and knowledge of the happenings of the present'.[3] It is this stage that is to be seen in the Old Testament, as also in classical Greek literature up to the end of the fifth century B.C. Professor Baillie cites as typical of the Old Testament view Job 10.21 f, Isa. 14.9-12, 38.18 f, Ps. 39.12 f, 88.9-12, 115.17 f, and of the Greeks the words of Achilles in *Odyssey* 11.488-491. There is a parallelism between the Greek and the Hebrew sequels, but the two doctrines which emerged were quite different—more different than Professor Baillie at some points seems to imply.[4]

As far as Greece is concerned, this third stage, foreshadowed in the Eleusinian mysteries of Demeter, really comes to birth with the Dionysiac mysteries. A further step was taken when the Orphics brought a strong intellectual interest to the worship of Dionysus and furnished it with an elaborate doctrinal system. The crowning-point of this development is to be found in the philosophy of Plato. The distinguishing feature of this third stage is that here we have the hope of a continued life of the soul that is really worthy of the name of life. With it we find the idea that the body is a hindrance to the life of the soul—'the body is a tomb', a prison-house from which the soul longs to be released.

---

[1] Pp. 62-156, to which I am much indebted in this and the next two paragraphs.

[2] Ibid. p. 73.

[3] Ibid. p. 73.

[4] e.g. on pp. 86-93 he seems excessively anxious to show that the soul can survive the body and on p. 113 he says of the Greek (Orphic and Platonic) belief in the immortality of the soul that we may see in it 'a very real preparation for the Christian hope. It was a true light'. But there are grounds for thinking that this belief in the *natural* immortality of the soul is positively blasphemous rather than just inadequate. It represents (1) a blurring of the distinction between God and man, the presumptuous claim on man's part that his real self is akin to God, sharing therefore by right in God's immortality (cf. Gen. 3.5—'ye shall be as God'!); (2) a failure to take seriously the real nature of man, the fact that a man is a whole, the *totus homo*; (3) a failure to take sin seriously, pretending that it is only the body that is evil, while the soul is pure, whereas in actual fact it is the whole man who is a sinner and therefore the whole man has to die; (4) a failure to recognise that the future life of the soul as of the body is not something fallen man has by natural right, but something that he receives as a gift of God's grace; (5) a despising of the body and therefore also of the Creator. A very useful corrective to Professor Baillie's account of the matter is to be found in A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, Part II, vol. 1, pp. 64-72, 114 f, 188-192, though Nygren is apt to be somewhat doctrinaire.

Among the Hebrews the third stage is associated with the rise of apocalyptic. The prophets had deliberately discouraged any preoccupation with the underworld. If in Sheol there is no communion with God, then there is absolutely nothing positive or worth thinking about in any continued existence or 'subsistence' of the soul after death. Attention was rather concentrated on the immortality of the people as a whole. There would be an age of blessedness for Israel inaugurated by the Day of the Lord, though only those who were alive when that Day came would share in its blessings. But the prophets' teaching of the individual's moral responsibility before God and the possibility of the individual having communion with God contained the seed of a larger hope, which is expressed in two late passages in the Old Testament, Isa. 26.19 and Dan. 12.2-3, the hope that those who in their life had trusted in God would at the Last Day be raised up by Him to share in the blessedness of His New Order. As Professor Baillie puts it, 'what is here contemplated is not a happier fate for the soul in the underworld, but a return of the man in his integrity, body and soul together, to a renewed earth after a temporary banishment to the underworld'.[1] This is the belief we find in Enoch and the other apocalyptic writings and in the Rabbinic literature. It was widely held by the Jews of our Lord's time, being the belief of the Pharisees, though opposed by the Sadducees. We see it reflected for example in John 11.24.

It is clear that it is this Jewish belief in the resurrection rather than the Platonic belief in the immortality of the soul which provides the necessary terms for the interpretation of the Easter narrative.[1] In the case of Jesus the resurrection of the Last Day is anticipated. The risen Lord is the ἀπαρχή of those who shall be raised hereafter.[2] For Him the eschatological resurrection has already been accomplished, which for us will not take place till the Last Day. The period which for Him lasted from 3 p.m. on the Friday till the Sunday morning 'very early' lasts for us from the moment of death until the Parousia. St. Mark gives no hint of what was for Christ the content of that day and a half, except that during that time His body was in the grave. But there are hints elsewhere in the New Testament. There is the word to the thief in Luke 23.43 ('Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise'), in which Paradise seems to mean the temporary abode of the souls of the righteous where they wait for the general resurrection.[3] There are also hints of further activity by Christ during this period—particularly in 1 Pet. 3.19, with which should be compared Acts 2.27, 31, Rom. 10.6-8, Eph. 4.8-10, John 5.25-29, and perhaps also Matt. 27.52 f.[4]

---

[1] op. cit., pp. 125 f.

At this point the question arises: What then happens to us between death and resurrection? The New Testament's answer seems to be that immediately on death the spirits of those who have trusted in Christ are taken into His presence. To die is 'to depart and be with Christ'.[5] But this spiritual life without the body is not the fulness of what God has in store for those that love Him. Far better than life in this world it certainly is, but it is still incomplete until the body is raised up at the Last Day. In Cullmann's words: The Christian dead 'live also likewise in a state, in which the tension between present and future still persists. For them too the question "How long?" (Rev. 6.10) has meaning.'[6]

The Empty Tomb implies that Christ's *body* was raised. Transformed it certainly was, changed from σῶμα ψυχικόν to σῶμα πνευματικόν,[1] for it was apparently able to pass through closed doors[2] and appear and disappear at will; but the real continuity is emphasised. The σῶμα ψυχικόν was transformed, not left behind in the tomb. The risen body still bears the marks of the wounds.[3] There is, however, in a different sense a real discontinuity, which, whether it is implied by the passive ἠγέρθη in 16.6 or not, is certainly made clear elsewhere in the New Testament. The New Testament does indeed sometimes speak of Christ rising, but it prefers to represent God as the active subject and to speak of God raising Christ or Christ being raised by God.[4] To such lengths did Christ's identification with us sinners go, that He shared with us the humiliation of burial—His body became something altogether passive, carried about and put away. His resurrection from such depths of ineffectiveness was the act of God. He *really* died *our* death: therefore it is more accurate to say that He was raised than that He rose.[5] Similarly, the fact that the resurrection did not take place immediately on the Friday afternoon is connected with His identification with us; that is part of its significance.

---

[1] But Christ's resurrection transcends these 'terms', and the argument of the NT is not from a general resurrection to the resurrection of Christ, but the other way round. Cf. Baillie, op. cit., pp. 138 f.

[2] 1 Cor. 15.20, 23.

[3] Cf. 'Abraham's bosom' in Luke 16.19 ff. See also Enoch 22.

[4] See further C. E. B. Cranfield, *The First Epistle of Peter*, pp. 84-86, G. Friedrich in TWzNT, II, p. 714, note 105, and p. 716, and Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 113-115.

[5] Phil. 1.23.

[6] O. Cullmann, *Christus u. die Zeit*, p. 214. On the question discussed in this paragraph see pp. 205-215 (i.e. the last chapter of the book). There is an Eng. Tr., *Christ and Time* (SCM Press).

Since our resurrection is bound up with His and means God's fashioning anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory,[6] we may be sure that there will also be for us a real continuity between our resurrection bodies and our present bodies. It is easy to write off the '*huius* carnis resurrectionem' of the creed of Aquileia or Tertullian's 'resurget caro, et quidem ipsa, et quidem omnis, et quidem integra' as merely crude; but to do so is perhaps to set less store by God's creation than God sets by it. Is it perhaps after all a truly Christian insight that our resurrection bodies will be our present bodies transformed rather than merely new bodies? That the *how* is altogether beyond our imagination is neither here nor there; for the resurrection is in any case a miracle.

---

[1] 1 Cor. 15.44. [2] John 20.19, 26.

[3] Luke 24.40 (unless we omit with D, etc.), John 20.27.

[4] Cf. Stauffer, op. cit., p. 115. But we must not put more weight on the mere use of the passive ἠγέρθη than it can bear; for a glance at a Concordance will show that the passive of ἐγείρω is often used without any properly passive force (e.g. Matt. 8.15, 9.19, Mark 2.12, 13.8, 22). Cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. I, p. 163. That the resurrection of Jesus was God's act is rather made clear by such statements as Acts 3.15. It has been suggested (TWzNT, II, 334) that John 2.19, 21; 10.17, 18 imply the idea that Jesus' resurrection was self-wrought, but this is not at all certain.

[5] *Pace* the *resurrexit* and ἀναστάντα of the Creeds! [6] Phil. 3.21.

The reality of Christ's risen body is startlingly emphasised by Luke 24.43 (cf. verse 39). We must not conclude that therefore His body *needed* such victuals, nor need we be offended. It is rather for us to grasp the paradox that the New Testament offers us, holding *together* such passages as Mark 12.25 and Luke 24.43, refusing, on the one hand, to ignore the mystery and otherness of the resurrection and, on the other, to deny that God is Creator. The Empty Tomb certainly implies that it was the whole Christ who died for us and that it is the whole Christ who lives for evermore; that He came to redeem us as whole men, not just a part of us; that the body is part of the human personality; and that contempt for the body and the physical is also contempt for the Creator.

It will perhaps be as well to point out here in concluding this section that our relationship to Christ's death and resurrection is not simple but richly complex, as Rom. 6 and Col. 3 indicate. Our justification means that in God's sight we died with Christ: as regards our status before God (though not as regards His interest in our sanctification) God no longer takes account of us as we are in our actual life and refuses to see us except in Christ. Our real life (i.e. the life which God treats as our life) is henceforth hid with Christ, is indeed the life which the risen and exalted Lord lives for us as 'our righteousness'. In other words, we are already in God's sight in one sense raised with Christ. Of that our baptism is the pledge. Or to put it still otherwise, *by faith* we have already died and been raised with Christ. It is also true to say that we are in process of being made partakers of Christ's death and resurrection, as the Holy Spirit works in us, enabling us to die daily to sin and to walk in newness of life. But our share in Christ's resurrection also stands before us as a promise, our baptism pointing forward to the day of our death, when we shall finally die to sin, and to the resurrection of our bodies at the Last Day, when we shall be made conformable to Christ's glorious body.[1]

---

[1] In addition to literature already referred to, mention may be made of the following: A. Oepke in TWzNT, I, pp. 368-372, on ἀνίστημι, etc., and in II, pp. 332-337, on ἐγείρω, etc.; A. M. Ramsey, op. cit., pp. 100-121; N. H. Snaith, *I believe in . . .*, pp. 115-121, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, p. 89, note 2, and "Life after Death: the Biblical Doctrine of Immortality," in *Interpretation* 1/3 (1947), pp. 309-324; E. Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 189-192; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (1952).

2. Complete or Incomplete?

We need not go over familiar ground again, to show that 16.9-20 is not an original part of this Gospel. Taking that for granted, we have four alternative explanations to choose from:

(i) The Gospel was never finished, Mark being in one way or another prevented from finishing it;

(ii) The Gospel was finished, but the conclusion was lost or destroyed by some mischance;

(iii) The Gospel was finished, but the conclusion was deliberately suppressed;

(iv) The Gospel was finished, and 16.8 was intended to be the end of the Gospel.

The second and third alternatives seem unlikely. If the last bit of the Gospel had been destroyed or lost during Mark's lifetime, he would surely have re-written it. Or, if he was not available or was dead by the time it was lost or destroyed, would not someone else have been able to restore it from memory—if it had already begun to be used in public worship? The second alternative would only be feasible, if the accident happened so soon after the writing of the Gospel that there had not yet been time for it to become familiar in the Church *and* if at that time Mark was already dead or in some other way unavailable. Certainly, the fact that we have no trace of the lost ending (unless Streeter was right in thinking John 20.11-18 and John 21 were based on it[1]) and that Matthew and Luke do not seem to have had it implies that, if it ever existed, it must have disappeared very early. On the other hand, deliberate suppression would seem to be improbable. If its disappearance is to be dated before the writing of Matthew and Luke, then it cannot have been suppressed because it did not agree with them. It would hardly have been suppressed in the interests of the Jerusalem tradition. Nor does Lake's suggestion that it was suppressed because it contained an account of an appearance of the risen Lord not as flesh and blood commend itself—Mark may not have stressed the reality of Christ's body in the way Luke 24.43 does, but it is scarcely likely that he would in any way deliberately have contradicted it.

The choice would therefore seem to lie between the first and fourth alternatives. We prefer the first; but as the fourth explanation has an impressive list of supporters (particularly of recent years[1]), we must consider the question with some care.

---

[1] *The Four Gospels* (1924, 5th imp. 1936), pp. 351-360.

J. M. Creed argues in support of the fourth alternative from the incoherence of verses 7 and 8.[2] He maintains that, if we stop at the end of 8, this incoherence remains latent; but that, as soon as we try to imagine how Mark could have gone on from there, the incoherence becomes intolerable. Any conceivable conclusion must either have left the angel's message hanging in the air or else have introduced a cumbersome explanation why the message was not delivered. Therefore Mark cannot have intended to prolong his narrative beyond verse 8. Had he so intended, he would have omitted the awkward words, 'they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid', as Matthew and Luke do, and also the African Old Latin Codex Bobbiensis in Mark itself. But Creed's argument falls to the ground, as soon as we recognise the theological significance of the women's silence; for then we can think of it as limited in time—they were silent only until Jesus Himself reassured them.

Lohmeyer's conclusion in favour of the Gospel's being complete at 16.8 is bound up with his view that verse 7 refers not to a Resurrection appearance but to the Parousia. After verse 7 there is nothing more to be related but the Parousia itself! This view we have already considered in Part I.

To turn now to Professor Lightfoot[3]—we are prepared to admit that he proves his case as far as the possibility of ending a sentence or paragraph or perhaps even a book with *γάρ* is concerned. We think also that he is justified over against those who maintain that *ἐφοβοῦντο* must either have a direct object, a completing infinitive, or a *μή*-clause, and that he is right in referring it to the fear of God rather than the fear of men. But we are still not convinced that Mark intended to end his Gospel without relating an appearance of the risen Lord. To judge by 1 Cor. 15.1 ff, the kerygma of the primitive Church included the fact of appearances, and St. Mark's Gospel is surely closely related to the preaching. As to the suggestion that the mention of the Lord's promise in 14.28 and 16.7 made it unnecessary to recount its fulfilment, because the promise

---

[1] To the list given by Dr Taylor, op. cit., p. 609, should be added: A. M. Farrer, *The Glass of Vision* (1948), pp. 136-146; *A Study in St. Mark* (1951), pp. 172-181.

[2] In *JTS*, vol. xxxi, pp. 175-180.

[3] *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, pp. 80-97, 106-116.

(being the Lord's) guaranteed its own fulfilment, the logical end of such an argument would seem to be that it was unnecessary to write a Gospel at all—one had only to point to the Old Testament promises!

Lightfoot suggests further: '. . . the event did not lend itself to narration in a book. . . . It is a matter of constant surprise to me that the revelation of the risen Lord to His disciples seems often to be treated as if it were barely more than a remarkable event, whereas we have every reason to believe that at first the solid earth must have seemed to reel beneath their feet, and the stars to be about to fall.' But, while we must at once admit that Lightfoot is right in stressing the shattering uniqueness of the Resurrection, we do not think that the argument quite meets the case. True reverence in Mark's situation surely would be, not to refuse to narrate that which had been revealed, but to narrate *that* and *that only* and *no less than that*—to follow revelation, neither going beyond it (as the Gospel of Peter does, relating the coming forth of Christ from the tomb) nor yet failing to narrate that which was revealed. To refuse to relate the Resurrection appearances out of a sense of reverence would be, we submit, not reverence but a false and mistaken humility, a sort of ἐθελοθρησκεία. The wisdom of silence, of which we spoke earlier, does not mean for us nor did it mean for Mark that we are not to proclaim what God has revealed. To fail to do so would be ingratitude and disobedience. What it does mean is that we are to proclaim it with fear and reverence and humility, and without glibness or self-complacence.

If someone is inclined to ask, 'Ah, but can you not see that for Mark to end his Gospel at 16.8 fits in with his motif of Messianic hiddenness?' our answer is: the Messianic hiddenness or incognito is not a theory read into the history by Mark but rather something integral to the historical events themselves, part of God's self-revelation, and therefore, if Jesus really did appear after His resurrection to His disciples, the Messianic hiddenness is no reason why Mark should not have intended to say so. The actual event of the Resurrection no human eye saw; to attempt to describe that would therefore be quite a different matter. As a matter of fact, the hiddenness is preserved by the events of the post-Resurrection period. On the one hand, the actual event of the Resurrection is not revealed: on the other hand, it is only to friends, to those who already in some sense believe in Him, that Jesus appears—not to Annas, Caiaphas or Pontius Pilate. And moreover even these appearances are marked by a certain reticence. We do not think that the Messianic hiddenness can justifiably be claimed as support for the view that Mark meant to end his Gospel at 16.8.

So, while recognising that the problem we have been considering is not one that can be solved with certainty, we judge that the most likely alternative is that Mark intended to include an account of at any rate one Resurrection appearance, but for some reason never finished his Gospel.

In closing we wish to draw attention to an important theological issue raised by the discussion of the Markan ending. Dr A. M. Farrer, arguing that Mark intended to stop at 16.8, says: 'So ends the story of Christ's earthly life: what would follow would be the story of the Risen Christ and of the Church.'[1] This would seem to imply that to the question whether the Resurrection appearances belong to the story of our Lord's earthly life or to that of the Church a simple answer can be given (and according to Dr Farrer it is that they belong to the story of the Church). But the matter is not so simple as all that. His statement seems to the present writer an instance of one-sidedness and lack of wholeness; for here surely is a case of *both . . . and* . . . rather than of *either . . . or* . . . . The Resurrection appearances belong in a real sense *both* to the story of our Lord's earthly life *and* to the story of His Church. By faith the life of the Church is continuous with the life of the apostles on the first Easter Day; but there is also a real discontinuity, a real and decisive break, that is marked by the Ascension. If we are to maintain the wholeness of Christian truth, we must take seriously both the continuity and the discontinuity. We must therefore reject the notion of the Church being the extension of the Incarnation (at any rate in the too simple form in which it is usually put forward[2]) and take the Ascension seriously not only as the exaltation of Christ, the transition to

---

[1] *The Glass of Vision*, p. 138.

[2] For a good discussion of the claim that the Church is the extension of the Incarnation see J. E. L. Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church* (1948), pp. 55-83. Cf. K. Barth, *Dogmatik im Grundriss*, pp. 149 f, R. N. Flew (Editor), *The Nature of the Church*, p. 321.

His Reign and High Priesthood, but also quite definitely as the fulfilment of His words in Matt. 26.11, 'Me ye have not always', that is, as marking a real going away of Christ, a real leaving His Church, that must be taken equally seriously with the other side of the paradox that is expressed in Matt. 28.20 ('Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world').[1] The Ascension marks the discontinuity or decisive division between the period of revelation and the period of the Church's mission between Ascension and Parousia. This is not its only significance, of course: we stress it now, however, because it is the aspect that is in danger of being overlooked. The Ascension intimates to the Church that the Gospel history is not merely a part of the Church's continuing life but is also in a real sense something marked off from it and external to it, and therefore something that is capable of calling it to order. Dr Farrer's statement by separating the Resurrection appearances from the rest of the Gospel history and including them in the story of the Church blurs the dividing-line and so represents a flattening out of this aspect of the Ascension. When the Ascension is no longer understood as marking a real division, the way is open for the notion of the Church as the extension of the Incarnation and for the failure to distinguish between the Head and the members and finally for that presumption with which the Church is tempted to rule Christ's criticism out of order and to refuse to allow Him to interfere any more in its affairs. We wonder whether there is a connexion between the inclination of some to conclude that Mark meant 16.8 to be the end of his Gospel and the tendency to play down the significance of the Ascension as marking a decisive division.

3. DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE SEVERAL ACCOUNTS

That there are a number of discrepancies between the several narratives is well-known. We must now consider them briefly.

(i) *Who first saw the risen Lord?* Paul[2] seems to imply that Peter was the first person to see the risen Lord and Luke agrees with him.[3] On the other hand, Matt. 28.9, John 20.14-17, and the Markan appendix agree that the Lord appeared first either to Mary Magdalene alone or to her and 'the other Mary'.[1] Mark 16.1-8 says nothing about Jesus Himself appearing to the women.[2]

---

[1] Cf. K. Barth, *Credo* (Eng. Tr.), pp. 113-116.

[2] 1 Cor. 15.5.

[3] Luke 24.34; also [12]. But could 24.24 conceivably suggest that the women *had* claimed to have seen Jesus?

(ii) *How many women came to the tomb?* As to the number and names of the women concerned there is a puzzling variety. According to Mark 16.1 three women came to the tomb—Mary Magdalene, Mary ἡ Ἰακώβου and Salome; according to Matt. 28.1 there were two—Mary Magdalene and 'the other Mary'; Luke names three women, two of whom are the same as in Mark, while for Salome he substitutes Joanna; but he seems to imply that these three were accompanied by others.[3] According to John Mary Magdalene was alone.[4]

(iii) *When did they prepare their spices and ointments?* According to Luke 23.56 it was on their return from the burial, apparently before the sabbath began, whereas according to Mark 16.1 they waited till the sabbath was over before buying their spices, i.e. till 6 p.m. on the Saturday.

(iv) *When did they come to the tomb?* According to Mark it was 'very early' on the first day of the week; but this expression is immediately qualified by the surprising 'when the sun was risen', which seems to contradict it (for after sunrise would hardly be 'very early'). D and the Old Latin[5] substitute the present ἀνατέλλοντος for the aorist ἀνατείλαντος ('was rising' for 'was risen')—apparently an attempt to smooth out the difficulty. Luke's 'at early dawn' and John's 'while it was yet dark' agree well enough with Mark's 'very early' but not with his 'when the sun was risen'. Lagrange seems to feel that he has solved the problem by pointing out that in Palestine in early April the sun rises before 6 a.m.;[1] but we do not find this very satisfying. Matthew, on the other hand, would seem to mean that the two Maries came to the tomb on Saturday evening after sundown: this would be (on Jewish reckoning) as the first day of the week was beginning. It is possible that G. F. Moore was right in thinking that Matthew's 'as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week' goes back to an earlier source than Mark, and that Mark's 'when the sun was risen' represents an unsuccessful attempt to improve on the Jewish-Greek *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων* or a misunderstanding of the Aramaic behind it. But this is by no means certain.[2]

---

[1] Matt. 28.9; cf. 28.1.

[2] Unless we were to adopt the text of D and k in verse 7: ὅτι ἰδοὺ προάγω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ με ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἴρηκα ὑμῖν: praecedo vos in Galileam; illic me videbitis, sicut vobis dixi. W and Syr.$^{hier.}$ also have the 1st person προάγω, and 40, 72, a, ff, and q have the 1st person sing. in the καθώς clause; but D and k are alone in reading με (me) for αὐτόν. The Dk reading, of course, implies that the 'young man' is the risen Lord Himself. This makes the latter part of verse 6 very awkward. The Latin MSS c and k omit οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, which would be extremely odd on the lips of the risen Jesus, and k and 251 and *l* 253 omit αὐτοῦ after μαθηταῖς. But the text of Dk here is certainly unlikely. Moreover, an explanation of how it could arise is not far to seek: we suggest that first εἶπεν was assimilated to the Matt. parallel εἶπον (the angel's solemn assurance), and then προάγει and αὐτόν were altered to fit in with the 1st person. The Bezan εἴρηκα could be a slip for εἶπον.

[3] Luke 24.10. Cf. 23.49, 55, 8.2 f.

[4] John 20.1, 11, 18. But could the plural 'we know' in 20.2 be a hint that there were others with her? On the question of the women's names see further V. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 651-653.

[5] c, ff, n, q, Aug.$^{cons.}$, Tich.$^{reg.}$

(v) *What was their purpose?* In Mark 16.1 it is 'that they might come and anoint him' and Luke 24.1 ('bringing the spices which they had prepared') must mean the same. But Matthew gives as the women's intention simply 'to see the sepulchre'. This is presumably because he has related the sealing of the tomb and the setting of the guard. Schniewind points out that in Matt. 26.12 the anointing of Jesus at Bethany is given more importance than in Mark 14.8.[3] To anoint a corpse that had been dead two nights and a day in the climate of Palestine is on the surface odd; yet love sometimes prompts people to do what from a practical point of view is useless. The intention to anoint the body would seem to imply that the burial had been only provisional, but the account of it gives a different impression.

(vi) *The angel or angels.* Paul does not mention an angel; but all four Gospels mention either an angel or angels. Mark and Matthew have one: Luke and John two.

---

[1] op. cit., p. 444.

[2] See M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, pp. 99 f for a full discussion of the verb *ἐπιφώσκειν*, which occurs in Matt. 28.1 and Luke 23.54. According to Black, A. Geiger (in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xii. 365) and G. F. Moore (in *Journ. American Orient. Soc.*, xxvi, 323 ff) have claimed that it has a Semitic sense and is equivalent to Heb. *'or* or Aram. *nᵉgah* idiomatically used of the breaking of the Jewish day at sunset or the drawing on of the following day any time after sunset. The verb is rare in secular Greek, where it always refers to the real dawn. In ecclesiastical Greek it is used in the sense claimed for it in the two Gospel passages. Black refers to F. C. Burkitt in *JTS*, xiv, 546. He also cites in support the Gospel of Peter ii.5 (M. R. James, *Apocryphal NT*, p. 91) and C. H. Turner (*JTS*, xiv, 189). See also V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 604.

[3] *Das Ev. nach Matthäus*, p. 276.

(vii) *The stone.* All four Gospels mention the stone: Paul does not.

(viii) *The Empty Tomb.* All four Gospels testify to the fact of the empty tomb: Paul does not mention it.

(ix) *Galilee or Jerusalem or both?* According to Mark the angel tells the women to tell the disciples that Jesus is going before them into Galilee and they will see Him there. Mark is apparently leading up to an appearance of the risen Lord in Galilee. Matthew does tell of such an appearance,[1] though he also relates an appearance to the women at Jerusalem (28.9 f). But Luke and John have appearances in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood and (apart from the Johannine appendix—chapter 21) give no indication of any appearance in Galilee. Luke has significantly altered Mark 16.7 into 'Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee. . . .' Moreover, Luke 24.49 ('Tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high . . .') and Acts 1.4 ('He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father . . .') might seem to rule out the possibility of Galilean appearances, as Lohmeyer thinks; but they do not necessarily require that interpretation, for both verses refer to words spoken immediately before the Ascension and so room is left for an appearance or appearances in Galilee before this saying.

(x) *The result of the angel's (or angels') words on the women.* According to Mark 16.8 the women 'said nothing to any one; for they were afraid'. Matthew also mentions their fear; but he couples with it 'great joy' and adds that they 'ran to bring his disciples word'. Luke says that they 'returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest'. But here it is to be noted that in Luke, although the women obey the angels and pass on the message, they are not believed by the disciples until their report is confirmed by the appearance of Jesus Himself. In Matthew Jesus Himself repeats the command to the women, who are apparently on their way to carry it out, and it is believed by the disciples. In John the angels do not give the command, but Jesus appears immediately to Mary Magdalene and He gives the command and she obeys. So in none of the Gospels is the angel's word *by itself* enough to bring conviction to the disciples: it is only effective when it is confirmed by the Lord Himself.[1]

---

[1] 28.16 ff.

There are further discrepancies, which are perhaps less significant—e.g. did the women actually enter the tomb or not? Was the angel (or angels), inside or outside the tomb? There are also the Matthew additions, and beyond what is relevant to these eight verses of Mark 16 there are other problems and differences, which need not concern us here.

The following observations may be made:

(i) While it is true that taken one by one the various differences can be more or less satisfactorily reconciled (and there is no need either to be unduly cavalier with such explanations or to be unduly pedantic in discovering discrepancies), yet the apparent difficulties are too numerous for this patient ironing away of them one by one to be altogether satisfying.

(ii) We must avoid a too easy escape into theology here. To try to by-pass historical embarrassments by seeking refuge in theology is surely to fail to take the Incarnation seriously enough. Not only does that mean bad history; it means also bad theology. We gain nothing of real value by wearing blinkers, however reassuring they may be. To take the Incarnation seriously is to be committed to a serious grappling with the historical problems.

(iii) At the same time it is only sensible to remember that differences between eye-witnesses of the same event are by no means an unusual phenomenon. G. A. Chadwick mentions in this connexion the fact that different participants in the battle of Waterloo disagreed about the time that it began.[2] We have no reason to think that the accounts lying behind the Resurrection narratives of the Gospels should be exempt from this liability to error.

(iv) As Professor Ramsey points out, it is not only in the Resurrection narratives that there are discrepancies in the Gospels, and it would be highly suspicious if just here everything agreed exactly.[3] The discrepancies are at least evidence that we have not here to do with a piece of carefully concerted deceit.

---

[1] Cf. Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, 3/3, p. 595.

[2] *The Gospel of St. Mark*, p. 439.

[3] *The Resurrection of Christ*, p. 67.

(v) Moreover—and here theology comes in!—there is the *uniqueness* of this Event. It was no mere restoration to ordinary life (as with Lazarus), but the eschatological resurrection of the dead. Should we not expect the wine-skin of human testimony to be severely strained under the terrific pressure of such a content?[1]

(vi) We should examine the cracks and signs of strain which appear in the wine-skin with all diligence; for they may well prove instructive.

(vii) The difficulties we meet here (along with all the other difficulties and perplexities of Holy Scripture) are a means by which Christ the King prevents us from snatching His sceptre out of His hand. Dearly would we like to wield it for Him! But that is not permitted to us. Scripture resists all our attempts to have it neatly and finally classified and labelled. Its difficulties may exasperate us, but they maintain its freedom over against us. God gives Himself really to us, but not in such a way as to allow us to get control of Him! But we shall only rightly recognise this, if we do honestly grapple with the historical problems: we are not to attempt to turn this theological insight into an escapism.

---

[1] Cf. Barth, *Credo* (Eng. Tr.), p. 100.

BOOK REVIEWS

Church and Ministry. By Professor G. D. Henderson. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 244. Price 10s. 6d. The Baird Lecture for 1950.

"It is noticeable that criticisms of Protestantism in *Catholicity* or other publications of like tendency seldom seem to ring true of the Church of Scotland . . . while criticisms of institutionalism, formalism, state relationship, that come from an opposite direction, also appear to miss the mark when directed against us." Here is a statement from the conclusion (p. 191) of Professor Henderson's stimulating book which may all too easily convey that air of being at ease in Zion which frequently disturbs a visitor to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It is spiritually dangerous to be a success at avoiding extremes, and the scriptural verdict on the Church at Laodicea stands as a perpetual warning for such successes.

Nevertheless, while one cannot but feel an uneasiness about this sort of thing of which this book has many examples, there is no denying that the statement itself is true, and this study covering four centuries of Scottish literature on its subject gives ample evidence that Presbyterian Scotland has a big contribution to make in current ecumenical discussion. It is a 'Reformed' Church giving such a central place to the Word of God that the writer can assert: 'In Scotland it was felt that a primary function of the Church was to listen' (p. 14), but it is also a Church which has never abated its concern for Catholicity. Professor Henderson has gathered in these pages a wealth of quotation from many writers to illustrate how these two traditions have been held together through the centuries. We must also be grateful that he has checked statements which might express merely individual ideas with the authoritative documents of the Church.

Chapter titles, which include 'The Marks of the Church', 'Unity', 'Catholicity', 'Apostolical Succession' and others, indicate at once that we are to follow paths well trodden in recent debate, but Professor Henderson has a pungency of phrase (e.g. 'to be a revolutionary one must give in to being a vertebrate' (p. 136)) which ensures that the journey is not dull, and a refreshing liveliness of approach which opens up many new vistas on this particular trip along these paths. In particular he has a remarkable ability to bring discussions down out of the clouds to the dusty facts of the workaday world. His effective illustrations from everyday things are calculated to deflate the learned nonsense of some theories in this field. We are not allowed to forget that the Church and its ministry are concerned with people in this world, the world into which the Son of God became incarnate. Accordingly when on page 81 Dr Henderson says that 'the main pressure for union . . . has been practical' and elaborates this by saying: 'Every discussion of the subject should take place in the light of the original purpose of Christ: His followers were to be one that the world might believe', he expresses an interest in the practical which gives to his book much of its virtue. In consequence, a discussion on *the marks of the Church* broadens out the conception of Church discipline to cover the whole vocation of the Christian man or woman in society. Again *Catholicity* is portrayed as something much richer than the mere party label which it has recently tended to become, perhaps all the more since the alarming classification of Churches as 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' propounded by the Faith and Order movement. Professor Henderson would surely echo the comment of F. D. Maurice (*The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 99): 'CATHOLIC *Party*! here lies the contradiction which is the seed of all others.' Or again, when Dr Henderson speaks of *apostolical succession* he underlines the apostolic commission of the Church today. Finally on the question of *validity* of ministerial orders he reminds us, with ample documentation, that the Reformers' primary concern was for spiritual effectiveness; and that 'it is more difficult to be a minister than to be a priest', so that the question they pressed about a man was less that of his technical authorisation in the past, as: 'is he a man of God, a man of prayer, well-seen in the Bible, and of consecrated manhood?' (p. 157).

The astringent quality of much of this book will be of value in the discussion of these themes, yet the book is not fully satisfying. This is partly because it leaves a doubt, in spite of its thorough documentation, as to whether its authorities are always quite fairly presented. On page 152 John the Baptist's saying: 'think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father . . .' (Matt. 3.9) is cited as a saying of Jesus, and this kind of slip shakes one's confidence about other quotations less easily verified.

Again there is the method of deflating high-flown theories about Church and Ministry, for example by setting certain doctrines of apostolic succession in juxtaposition with examples of tribal tradition (pp. 136-140). Justified as this may be when applied to mere human imaginings, the method if too recklessly used ends by dissipating altogether the sense of awe and mystery which has its necessary place in meditating on a Divine gift. The New Testament is practical enough, close to the workaday world, yet in its reference to Church and Ministry its authentic note is one of awe for it is 'through the Church' that the manifold wisdom of God is now made known even to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places (Eph. 3.10), and the Ministry, no matter how we debate its forms, is God's gift to His Church. Therefore when this is our theme, healthy though it is to keep close to solid earth, let us beware of a jauntiness which obscures the fact that the theme itself is sacred.

Finally there is the matter of unity. Professor Henderson is clearly a friend of reunion. He knows that the claim that different denominations are trustees for aspects of the truth makes sense only if they bring all into a common store, and is dangerous nonsense if they are content to stay apart. He says well that 'it does not do for a small group to insist upon a separate existence any more than for a would-be Christian individual to maintain independence of the Church. This remark one might extend to include even great national Churches, whose sheer size may blind us to the fact that they also are splinters' (p. 84). Yet in this matter something more is wanted than the admonitions of a spectator or the benevolent interest of a friendly observer. Unity is not the pet theme of a few eccentric Churchmen. It is embedded in the Gospel itself, for everything the New Testament has to say about reconciliation in Christ is grievously distorted and indeed denied if people reconciled in Christ remain divided from each other. It is this which makes any complacency about denominationalism intolerable and it is just the fact that, in spite of statements like that quoted, these pages seem more concerned to show that on the whole the Church of Scotland has favoured unity than to express an urgent concern for the cause of unity that they leave one less than fully satisfied.

William Stewart

The Structure of the Divine Society. By F. W. Dillistone. Lutterworth Press, 1951. 16s.

Any considerable contribution to the doctrine of the Church is welcome in these days of ecumenical conversations, and Dr Dillistone is well qualified by experience both of the Anglican and the Reformed traditions to advance the discussion. The main thesis of this book is that both in international diplomacy and ecclesiastical discussion there are two main ideas which are constantly recurring —the idea of organic unity, and the idea of covenant or federal bond. In both sacred and secular departments both these concepts are necessary, for the one supplements the other, and while tension may arise between them, it can always be a fruitful tension, and never need amount to a contradiction.

The book takes us through the Old and New Testaments, showing us the development of organic and covenantal ideas there, and a historical section shows, among other things, how little part the idea of the Church as body of Christ plays between the New Testament and St. Augustine. It was not till Calvin that the attempt was made to conceive of the Church predominantly in terms of the covenant of God. There is a most interesting section on the Federal Theology of the seventeenth century and the religious thought of New England. A certain stiffening of thought, says Dr Dillistone, led theologians to lose sight of the dialectic of law and grace which is an essential element in both the Old Testament and the New. To this Biblical tension the thought of Calvin had done justice.

In this review we have room for only one main criticism. All through his book the author is trying to deal, not only with the Christian Society but with other forms of society also. The very cautiousness of Dillistone's thought makes it hard to formulate this criticism, and he could certainly cite passages from the book which show that he is alive to the danger into which in the end he falls. The error is in his use of concepts to describe both the Church and secular forms of society, and it appears most clearly in the use of the concept of organism. Not only does Dr Dillistone say that the concept of organism alone is inadequate to grasp the nature of the Church. He also quotes with evident approval, the statement of Aquinas that to speak of the Church as a body is to speak metaphorically, since it is obvious that there are differences between the natural body of man and the mystical body of Christ.

But it does appear that, later on, Dr Dillistone takes the concept of body in an abstract manner, and asks what is essential to the organic concept (Ch. X), and then carries over to the body of Christ some of the characteristics which are only fittingly used of natural organisms. He criticises Father John T. Dittoe for his comparison of the Church to a human body. In the passage of Dittoe quoted certain characteristics of the Church are selected, by reason of which it is said to be like a human body—the members are subordinated to the Head, and so on. But Dittoe points out that the figure cannot be used of the Church in every respect—the Head has here an independent existence, and the members also exist—though not as such—independent of their membership, and so forth. To these sensible remarks Dillistone rejoins that 'the fatal objection to such a line of reasoning is that the initial definition makes a selection of certain important elements of that which in nature is called an organism, but omits certain other elements which are of equal importance. For example, nothing is said about relation to environment, and yet it is a basic tenet of modern organic theory that to speak of an organism out of relation to its environment is a meaningless use of language' (p. 177). Surely Dr Dillistone is here clearly committing the error of taking a general concept, determining what belongs to it, and then asserting that because the Church is Christ's *body*, it must therefore be in such and such a relation to its environment. We will admit that in fact the Church cannot be indifferent to its environment. But this necessity does not arise from its being a body, since a body, to be a body, must draw order out of the disorder of its environment. The necessity comes from the Church's duty to proclaim the gospel to the men amongst whom it is set. When St. Paul calls the Church the body of Christ, he does so, indeed, because of certain real resemblances of the Church to a body, but we are not for that reason justified in asking what are all the essential characteristics of a body, and then demanding that the Church conform thereto. It appears that because Dr Dillistone carries over too uncritically characteristics of physical bodies and applies them to the Church, he limits the concept of the body unduly, and in some ways exacts of the Church what he has no right to ask. For example, on p. 237 the connexion of the Church with the State, and on p. 238 a close relationship with the State—the environment—are apparently asserted as natural consequences of the organic nature of the Church. Anglo-Catholics would, in our view rightly, maintain that a close relationship with the State may well obscure if not endanger the character of the Church as the body of Christ. On the other hand the concept of organism by no means allows us to assert that the continuity of the Church is necessarily of the almost physical kind asserted by many Anglo-Catholics.

We may say that in spite of a desire to appreciate John Calvin, Dr Dillistone is hardly fair to the Calvinist doctrine of the Church. It is certainly not true to say that Calvin speaks more of the Church in terms of covenant than of the body of Christ; and Dr Dillistone clearly does wrong when he discusses Calvin's doctrine of the Church by importing into it from an earlier section the federal idea, which Calvin deliberately keeps in the background at this point in order to make clear that his main idea is of the Church as the body of Christ. This vitiates Dr Dillistone's whole interpretation of Calvin. He is hardly nearer the mark when he speaks of Calvin 'as if he conceived the Church and the ministry almost exclusively in terms of doctrine and intellectual apprehension and dutiful obedience to the word thus apprehended' (p. 128). But surely he was in fact no more an intellectualist than St. Clement of Alexandria, who loved to speak of the Christian life as a process of education by the Word. For if Calvin had been merely interested in correct doctrine, he would have defined faith as assent to truth and not as he does, as union with Christ in the Church. Surely it is in his chapters on the Sacraments that we find his teaching on the body of Christ most profoundly expressed. One has the impression that with Dr Dillistone the notion of faith belongs largely to the covenant concept of the Church, but is it not by faith that the members of the body are united with Christ their head? It is only where a sub-personal general conception of organism is rigidly applied to the notion of the body of Christ, that the personal relation of faith (p. 181) is in danger of being swallowed up 'within an amorphous pantheistic medium of a vague Divine-humanity'.

Continuity of the Church in space, a unity which will express itself in intercommunion and the breaking down of divisive barriers, is urgently important. The expression of continuity in time is also important but cannot be accepted in such a form as will endanger the sovereignty of the Head ruling and reforming His body through the Word. It is only with an Anglo-Catholicism where this sovereignty appears endangered that the Church of Scotland feels a difficulty in treating.

We agree with the importance of the two concepts of the body of Christ and of the covenant community—how could we do less, seeing that both are well founded in Scripture? But we are a little doubtful of the way in which Dr Dillistone allots characteristics essential to the faith to this concept and that. And curiously he has very little to say of the Church as the bride of Christ. For as he himself says, here the organic and covenantal elements are fused in a wonderful manner.

These criticisms arise in the mind of a Presbyterian wrestling with the argument of this book. They are put forward with a certain diffidence, and in the conviction that the book is an able and powerful contribution to the ecumenical conversation, which stimulates the reader perhaps most of all where he cannot agree with it.

David Cairns

A Dialogue with God. By John Oman. James Clarke and Co. 7s. 6d.

The appearance of this book is something of a surprise, and at such a reasonable price! It is most likely that this is the very last book that we shall receive from the pen of John Oman, and we should be grateful to those who decided to exempt these sermons from the application of his expressed desire that his papers should be left undisturbed. Principal Oman wrote many things hard to be understood, but it should not be held against a man that he resembled the Apostle Paul. It is probable that a book like *Natural and Supernatural* has not had many general readers and that few will make much of it, though there are treasures in its hidden places. The two books that are likely to have a long innings are *Vision and Authority* and *Grace and Personality*.

Fifteen years ago Dr Oman gave us a book called *Concerning the Ministry* –a veritable storehouse of the richest wisdom, often pawkily phrased, on every aspect of the minister's life and work. The present book might be regarded as a companion volume. Both books are simple and direct, at least to a degree not attained in his other writings. Yet this can hardly be described as popular reading, and there is not much of the light touch. Most of these addresses are too full for the average congregation, and there are many sentences so condensed that people would stop to wonder what was meant and so be left behind. But these two kindred books reveal that Oman, great as he was as philosopher and theologian, had a strong pastoral instinct and concern which remained with him all his life. Also, he was profoundly interested in all matters pertaining to public worship and private prayer. In this connexion, the present reviewer recalls that Oman once said to him in a railway carriage that he believed that, while people in Scotland went to Church better than people in England, a higher proportion of people in England said their prayers than in Scotland. It was interesting and a little startling.

It is remarkable that sermons which were preached fifty years ago during Oman's ministry in Alnwick (only one or two appear to date in the years of the first war), should be published now. The editor naturally found a certain remoteness in them when he first read them, but that is superficial, and they have a forward-looking quality and a notably timeless character. Preaching can never have been easy for a man like Oman, and these sermons could never reach crowds. Faith itself can never have been easy for a man like Oman, but always a battle with terrible realities. As one of these sermons puts it: 'It is a good thing that we are getting done with the idea that belief in God's goodness and care is an easy truth to be picked up anywhere and retained by any kind of sensible action in this world.' Every sermon embodies an honest search for truth and a fearless exposition of it.

These sermons are all short, and not burdened with illustrations. There are a few excellent illustrations from nature and art, and a very good one from legend on page 55, but hardly any from literature. Poetry is quoted only three times, and two of these are from Burns and in one sermon. There are, however, many striking metaphors and similes. Nearly every sermon has what many take as an essential mark of a good sermon—the last short paragraph devoted to a closing appeal of a quiet, earnest, personal, child-like, evangelical kind. Perhaps the most moving of the sermons are 'The Purpose of Calamity', 'Turfing the Grave', and 'Incarnate Majesty'. The address on 'Paul the Apostle' is wonderfully rich and comprehensive, and there is a fine sermon for Communion on 'The Glory of Christ'.

There are few volumes of sermons that can safely be recommended to preachers. It ought always to be a benefit to see how others do it, but somehow most preachers have chosen for publication what they regard as their best sermons, and it is usually difficult for others to make any use of them except by lifting them in whole or large part. But once in a while a volume appears with paragraphs or sentences so replete with distilled wisdom that these paragraphs or sentences kindle the mind and set the reader off on his own trail and towards another text or passage. A volume like Denney's *The Way Everlasting*, is a conspicuous example, and here is another, not so great but similar. This review may therefore end with a few of these sentences. 'The true spirit of meekness is like the fresh green grass which bends because of the power in it.' 'To seek to accomplish nothing less than God's victory in the earth—nothing less is worthy to absorb any man's whole attention.' 'Take your life and all its actions out of the twilight of common opinion and set them in the full light of God's truth.' 'Human power can cause death, but it cannot shed a single ray of light into its darkness.' 'Christ is a pilot, not a tide, and you get the direction right only as you steer by Him.' 'The true confidence in prayer is in knowing that the highest thing we ask for is the thing God has already granted to us.' 'Few people really improve with prosperity.' 'The same frame of mind which permits one sin, permits all.' 'God stands back and waits for our answer.' 'Paul, like every other man who uses his energies to their utmost limit, was quick tempered.' 'Christ's most terrible denunciation is as much the utterance of this love as His gentlest appeal.' 'The New Testament says a good many unkind things about majorities.' 'Our real failure is that we estimate material well-being so highly that we do not start with a poor man as our brother but as a naturally inferior order of creation.' And—what gives the book its title—'Life is just one unending dialogue with God in which none of us can escape in the end from saying exactly what is in our hearts.'

George S. Gunn

Jeremiah, His Time and His Work. By A. C. Welch. Blackwell. 15s.

The re-issue of this book (first published in 1928) is welcome. Jeremiah lived in a time of acute crisis for Israel. He saw a sweeping religious reform, he lived in a state subject to strong political and military pressure, and he experienced the overthrow of the central institutions of the ancient ecclesia; and Dr Welch helps us to see how to this prophet was given in such a situation a unique word from God for his people. The preacher who seeks to understand the prophetic task in our own time will find much in this book.

From the standpoint of Old Testament scholarship Dr Welch's work deserves to be re-read today. At a time when the classical Wellhausen position was much less criticised than it is now, Welch's thought showed notable originality, an originality which can be appreciated only when we read the whole of his work and see that he not only challenged the prevailing view of Deuteronomy but offered a complete reinterpretation of the material from the latter days of the Northern kingdom down to the return of the exiles and the composition of Chronicles. The present book is of course deeply coloured by the writer's peculiar view of the Deuteronomic code and the Josianic reform. But even those who think that view rather too good to be true will find this study careful, discriminating and refreshing.

James Barr

Existenz und Offenbarung. By Heinz-Horst Schrey. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen. R.M. 9.80.

Existence, temporality, dimensionality, history, crisis, eschatology, revelation—such words are the familiar current coin of present-day theology. This volume, apparently the first to come from Dr Schrey's pen, makes ample use of them all. Existence is understood to consist essentially in temporality, and the attempt is made to carry the analysis of such temporal existence a little further than has been done by earlier writers. The way is prepared by a somewhat elaborate criticism of two mistaken understandings of temporality—that of Wilhelm Dilthey and that of Friedrich Nietzsche. The analysis then proceeds by way of a consideration of the three 'dimensions' of time, and it is shown how man stands distressfully 'between' these dimensions—between past and present, and between present and future. This existence 'between the times' seems to look forward to a fulfilment which it cannot itself achieve. The sentiment of wonder, which the child has in common with the philosopher, and the desire for wholeness of life, are negative indications of the feeling after some non-temporal or transcendent reality; while the sentiment of awe, the pricks of conscience and the awareness of guilt provide more positive indications. Only revelation, however, can offer such fulfilment; and moreover only the Christian revelation, because there alone do we find God approaching us from beyond ourselves.

Dr Schrey would not claim anything very new in the argument But the book is competent, well written and easy to read. Once again, however, one cannot help deploring the fact that German theologians still continue to ignore nearly all that is thought and written outside their own country. The only Anglo-Saxon references are in two footnotes, in one of which Bertrand Russell is mentioned, and in the other Reinhold Niebuhr (whom, incidentally, the bibliography confuses with his brother Richard). Such theological inbreeding is not a healthy sign.

John Baillie

Calvin's Sermons. 1. *The Mystery of Godliness, And Other Selected Sermons* ($3.00). 2. *The Deity of Christ and Other Sermons* ($3.50). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Coy., U.S.A.

Of the vast number of sermons which Calvin preached, many have never been published, even in their original French, but these are the only two volumes of them which have appeared in a modern English translation. They are a most welcome addition to the library of the minister who takes his duty of expounding the Word of God seriously, and to the theologian who wishes to understand Calvin's theology right at its source: in his exposition and preaching of Holy Scripture. The first volume is a republication of fourteen sermons on 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus first published in the U.S.A. in 1830; the second volume comprises twenty sermons translated into English for the first time from the French and Latin by the Rev. Leroy Nixon: on the nativity, the passion, resurrection, ascension and final advent of Christ. Both volumes read very well in English, and reveal incidentally but with startling clarity the person of Calvin, above all as preacher and shepherd of the flock, whose supreme duty it was to bring the Gospel in all its simplicity and desperate urgency to bear upon the unbeliever in order to win him for Christ, and to nourish the believer with the bread of life that more and more in Word and Sacrament he might be united with his Lord in one Body.

Here we have clearly expressed Calvin's characteristic understanding of the Word: 'If God should speak according to His majesty, His speech would be beyond our comprehension: it would utterly confound us. He formeth His speech to us in His Word according to our capacity' (1, p. 106); 'So since we are carnal, He must stutter. God made Himself little to declare Himself to us' (2, p. 18). It is because Revelation is this 'stuttering' in our language in accommodation to our weakness that we must be careful of the way in which we use our terms and comparisons in understanding the divine Truth. It is with a faith that teaches our minds to rise above all earthly conceptions that we must use the orthodox and traditional formulations of Trinitarian dogma, for example, realising that here we are confronted with a mystery which far surpasses our human intelligence. In the same way in the doctrine of election we must remember that, though we have to consider the will of God in two ways, God's will is not double in itself, for this is an adaptation to our weakness (1, p. 106). Calvin emphasises the fact therefore that even in Scripture we see through a glass darkly and only with refracted vision, so that true faith extends its vision beyond to the coming of Christ when He will show Himself to us in His glory. Faith 'looks for the day when that which we now see in part will be wholly and perfectly revealed to us' (1, p. 13). It is indeed by this very orientation of our mind, our attitude to Christ's coming in glory, our desire to see Him face to face, that we can judge whether or not we have true faith in Jesus Christ (2, p. 240 f). The eschatological perspective belongs to the very essence of faith (1, p. 64 f).

That comes out in a different way in these sermons, as in all Calvin's works. Faith entails union with Christ, and apart from that union with Christ there is no communication of the substance of the Gospel to us, or indeed any real understanding of the Gospel at all (2, pp. 254-267). Faith means, however, not only that we have entered into the Kingdom, entered into union with Christ and so become 'sharers of His Ascension' (2, p. 239), but it means that we must follow on 'until we are fully united to Christ'. 'God does not call us to Himself in order to hold us in a static condition, but that He may urge us on always, until He has led us to perfection' (2, p. 203). Thus the whole idea of union with Christ, so central in Calvin's teaching, is itself part of his eschatolology, as his teaching about Baptism and Eucharist in these pages also makes clear (2, p. 174 ff). Union with Christ involves our death and resurrection in Him, on the ground that Christ has already accomplished our reconciliation, and acquired for us the perfect righteousness in which we participate in Him. It is that completed work which is sealed and ratified in baptism; but we grow in this union, and all our life, therefore, is characterised by mortification and regeneration, so that 'we die not only once but we must suffer patiently to be buried until the end', having faith in Christ, the first-fruits, who is a sure pledge of our resurrection and believing firmly that our life is hidden in Him (2, p. 182). Thus although we are justified once and for all, of which Baptism is the testimony (2, p. 214 ff), we continue to be gathered by Christ through His death into His Body by the power of the resurrection (upon which the emphasis of our faith must be laid, else the death of Christ can only 'scandalise us' (2, pp. 284, 288). In this Holy Communion is our continual exercise, for there we are nourished with the substance of Christ's Body and more and more coalesce with Him until we become altogether one with Him (2, p. 255). The Eucharist carries with it a doctrine of growth in grace, growth in union with Christ, reaching out beyond our sinful life and beyond death, into the perfect union with Christ in His glory. Faith is an entry already into union with Christ, in which we possess Christ Himself, the whole substance of the Gospel, and yet, at the same time, through faith 'we wait for God to show the fruit and power of the death and passion, which His only Son endured, by which we have been reconciled' (2, p. 182). 'It is true that our redemption has been accomplished by His death, but yet when we shall be stripped of this body, then we shall be stripped of the servitude of sin. That is why death ought to be desirable to us. So, since the universal redemption will not be till the last day, we must also surely groan, as all creatures groan, waiting for this day, since they are subject to corruption because of the sin of man, and they desire to be delivered from it. So then, heaven and earth, and all other creatures desire that Jesus Christ may appear, in order to restore all things' (2, p. 241).

There can be little doubt that it is this perspective which helped to give the sermons of Calvin their note of urgency and their compelling power. This is an aspect of the great Reformer's teaching that is largely lost sight of, but it was an aspect which he gained from his faithful exposition of Holy Scripture. It is that Biblical basis together with his reverent and obedient handling of it in his teaching that made Calvin supremely great as preacher and theologian. His own words given in one of these sermons aptly indicate his whole procedure: 'We must not read Holy Scripture in order to support our own notions, and favourite sentiments; but submit our own notions unto the doctrine contained therein, agreeably to the whole contents of it; for it is all profitable. When I expound Holy Scripture, I must always compass myself by it, that those who hear me, may be profited by the doctrine held forth, and receive edification thereby' (1, p. 133 f).

Wm. B. Eerdmans are to be congratulated on their publication of these volumes, and it is to be hoped that they will encourage Mr Nixon and others to translate a great deal more, for in an English dress Calvin's Sermons will prove of inestimable service to the

Church and her ministry in preaching and teaching the Word of God.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms, 1521. By GORDON RUPP. S.C.M. Press. 9s.

THIS is a masterly little volume which must take first rank among the many works that in recent years have been devoted to a rediscovery of Martin Luther. In his introduction Mr Rupp writes: 'When the last word has been written, we shall see Luther through a glass darkly, and what we behold will lack something which in the days of his too, too solid flesh was perceptible by some unlettered oaf who gaped at him in the streets of Wittenberg, or by some child who stared back at him along the lanes of Worms.' But those who look through Mr Rupp's eyes will without any doubt see the historical Luther in those early years of his life more clearly and vividly here than in any other recent work in English, if not also in German. Continental literature on the subject, German and Scandinavian, Lutheran and Roman, has been carefully sifted, and the best fruits of that research are given here, while the author's own brilliant scholarship and pungent language (so often a match even to that of Luther himself) set the matter forth in a way that commands the attention from start to finish and makes one impatient to have the next work on Luther from Mr Rupp's pen. It is to be hoped that he will complete his study of Luther's life and work in further volumes.

'Whatever the truth about Luther, it will never be found by those who by-pass his theology' (p. 8). Here the inmost, most personal experience of Luther along with his theological and exegetical discoveries are set out in their unity, and supply the key which unlocks so much of the dramatic history. We have had great works on Luther in the past, such as those of T. M. Lindsay and James MacKinnon, but the theological understanding often left much to be desired. This book supplies us with what we needed in revaluing Luther's spiritual development. If it has a fault, it is that again and again just when we are given real insight and theological questions of great moment are laid bare, the author passes on, no doubt leaving that for later systematic exposition.

The old idea, still disseminated, that Luther was a nominalist is well exploded in these pages, while the influence of Peter Lombard on the one hand and German mysticism on the other hand is critically estimated. Luther's revolutionary discovery, made during his early lectures on the Psalms, about the divine Justice is excellently brought out. 'That the word *Justitia* contained Luther's religious problem is important. It is even more momentous that within this word lay the tension between two mighty vocabularies, the Hellenic conception of Justice and the Biblical theme of the Righteousness of God. But for Luther *Justitia* was the problem, not to be softened by putting along side it other ideas, such as the mercy (*misericordia*) or the goodness (*bonitas*) of God. Luther did not need to be told that all medieval theologians had a doctrine of Grace and Justification. The illumination came when, through this very conception "Justice", there burst the saving intervention of a merciful God, displayed in Jesus Christ and freely bestowed on sinners. As Karl Holl has it, "God does not send His Grace alongside His Righteousness, but He sends it through His Righteousness . . . this was more than a new exposition . . . it was the fountain spring of a new doctrine of God" ' (p. 35).

'The Reformation is – ordeal by History.' Such an account Mr Rupp sets out to give of Luther's progress toward Reform, and Mr Rupp knows how to do it with a realism of language and description which not only debunks some of the 'myths' but sets out the historical facts with all the authentic drama and urgency of that eschatological *Stündlein.* Long after one has laid down the book, many of its word-pictures still ring in the ear, while not a few of the swift characterisations continue to provoke a chuckle, such as 'Erasmus, the flitting Dutchman'. Everyone will enjoy Mr Rupp's humour, but the greatest merit of his book is that it succeeds as few such studies do in precipitating the reader right into the midst of Luther's 'blessed strife' and 'mighty duel', while the citations from Luther's writings set down here cannot fail to infect the reader, be he quiet scholar or busy pastor, with a deepened sense of his vocation. 'Let there be a new and great conflagration. Who can resist the counsel of God? . . . God alone is in this business. We are carried away by Him. We are led rather than lead.' 'I beg of you, if you have a right feeling for the Gospel, do not think this matter can be carried through without tumult, scandal, or sedition . . . this is God's war, who did not come to bring peace . . . you ought to beware of thinking that Christ will achieve things in the earth quietly and softly, when you see that He fought with His own blood, and afterwards all the martyrs.'

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings. By J. A. MONTGOMERY. Edited by H. S. Gehman. The International Critical Commentary. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1952, p. xlviii + 576. 35s.

THE commentary is written in the traditional pattern of the I.C.C.

series, supplying the fundamental text-criticism, the interpretation as reflected in the ancient versions with later and modern interpretations, and translation. Account has also been taken of the results of archaeological research. In the fields of chronology and history, the author has been compelled to refer the student to authoritative monographs. In the Introduction the editor, Professor Gehmann, has added his own chronological tables. The writer acknowledges his debt to an annotated copy of Eissfeldt's Commentary on Kings and gives high appreciation of Professor Sanda's *Die Bücher der Könige* (1911).

In such a commentary, the Hebrew text requires the closest study. Of special interest therefore is Dr Montgomery's estimate of the value of the versions. He has much sympathy with the warning of H. S. Nyberg's *Back to the Study and Interpretation of the Massoretic text*, that only a small number of readings found in the versions has any value for text-correction, and he adopts a commendable caution in the acceptance of emendations and conjectures.

Though the latest edition of Brown-Driver-Briggs was not available, Professor Montgomery gives us the fruits of extensive gleanings in the philological field. Though the etymology of TOPHET is still dubious and the investigation of ASHIMA (2 Kings 17.30) supplies little or nothing not already known, the Ugaritic texts have made it quite certain that the word BAALZEBUL (from the root ZBL—Prince) is the original form of the name. BAALZEZUB—fly-god—though not an original form, seems to have had a history of its own.

In the Hebrew Canon, Dr Montgomery points out, the Books of Kings had place among the 'Former Prophets', but this does not altogether deny them the merit of recounting, *inter alia*, true history. The history writing of Kings falls, according to Dr Montgomery, into the class of the Historical Story, that is, *historia* in the Latin sense, —contemporary narrative as contrasted with the record of the past (*annales*). The author cites Eissfeldt's statement that in spite of the rich information which we have from Greece, Rome and the Orient for large parts of the last twelve centuries B.C., the Old Testament remains our most important *Geschichtsquelle*. As sources the commentary distinguishes (*a*) personal (royal) archives contemporary with the events recorded, (*b*) state archives or annals, and (*c*) possibly temple-archives. To these are added (*d*) political narratives and (*e*) stories of the prophets, e.g. the Elijah cycle of legends. Kings contains little great literature, but the book is 'the first ordered attempt at a national history that we possess from antiquity'.

O. S. RANKIN

The Religious Thought of St. John. By Edwin Kenneth Lee. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. 270. 17s. 6d.

The author in his Preface craves the indulgence of his readers for a book produced amid the crowding tasks of parish life. Let it be said at once that no apology is necessary. For this is a most able study, bearing on every page the evidence of wide reading and deep reflection. It is indeed an exceptional achievement that the Vicar of a busy colliery parish should produce a work of such detailed and careful scholarship. If one were to voice any criticism it would be, not that the dust and heat and distraction of the ministerial office have been allowed to intrude into these pages too frequently, but precisely that they have been too much kept out. The march of the argument is almost too measured and dispassionate, and one finds oneself wishing that occasionally the writer would let himself go and demonstrate the urgent thrust of Biblical theology out into life and action. Perhaps one day he will give us another book that will do this. It would achieve the distinction that this volume just misses.

Not a few scholars have seriously overestimated the Hellenic strain in the thought of the fourth evangelist. It is certainly tempting to deduce the Johannine Logos doctrine from Greek philosophy as represented by Heraclitus, Plato and the Stoics: the Logos conception, said Harnack, was 'Greek philosophy *in nuce*'. But Mr Lee wisely refuses to follow the once popular fashion of finding the basic Johannine affinities in Stoicism or the Hermetic literature. He would probably agree that even the much canvassed Alexandrianism of the fourth Gospel is largely a creation of the critical imagination. The intrinsic quality of the Gospel is Hebraic, not Hellenic. It is astonishing that scholars like Reitzenstein should so dogmatically have derived the Logos of the New Testament from Stoic-Hermetic speculations, when staring them in the face on page after page of the Old Testament was the doctrine of the *d^{e}bar Yahweh*—'by the word of the Lord were the heavens made' (Psalm 33.6)—the Word as the agent of God in creation, the expression of His purpose and the revelation of His will. Probably the Ephesian background of the Johannine literature misled too many of its interpreters: what needs to be reasserted today is the Palestinian character of the tradition it embodies. This has a bearing, moreover, on the question of the relationship of the fourth Gospel to the Synoptics. It is not very long since it would have been regarded by many as axiomatic that, wherever divergences appeared, the witness of the Synoptics was to be unhesitatingly preferred to that of John. But if John is predominantly Hebraic in character, and if behind the Ephesian formulation of the tradition lie Palestinian and Syrian sources, Jerusalem or Antioch or both, then clearly this axiom will require drastic revision. This is a crucial matter which deserves fuller attention than this book gives it. But when the author writes: 'The day is over when the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists could be played off against each other. The problem is too delicate and complex for such crude methods', his warning is salutary and his judgment sound.

One of the distinctive marks of Biblical study at the present time is the reawakened interest in eschatology. It is greatly to be desired that the teaching of the fourth Gospel should be re-examined from this angle. What is John's conception of the last things? Has he such a conception? Or has the doctrine of eternal life as realised in time, the possession of the believer here and now, spiritualised away the apocalyptic hope? Are we to follow Wendt and Charles and simply dismiss the Johannine references to a final judgment as textual interpolations alien to the evangelist's mind? Mr Lee's position appears to approximate to that of the 'realised eschatology' school. 'The terms of primitive eschatology,' he writes, 'are put on the lips of our Lord, but these are reinterpreted in such a way that the "last day" is no longer an apocalyptic event of some future date, but a fact realised by the present attitude of men to Christ. The "last day" of which Jesus spoke is, according to the Evangelist, that moment when men accept or reject the light that is already shining in the world.' The 'second coming' vanishes, or at least is reinterpreted to mean the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and the continual invisible coming of Christ to believing hearts. But this contention does something less than justice to the complexity of the Johannine doctrine of redemptive history. By the mighty act of God at the Cross and the Resurrection the power of the prince of darkness has been broken once for all, and life eternal in the midst of time is now the mark of the community of the redeemed. Yet no more in John than in Paul does this decisive transition from death to life eliminate the fight of faith and the patience of hope. It is just because Christ has already vanquished evil and judged it with an irrevocable doom that faith looks so steadfastly towards the last day and awaits His glorious reappearing. Today, when the problem of Christianity and history is right in the centre of theological debate, a thoroughgoing research into Johannine eschatology is overdue. In the meantime, Mr Lee is to be thanked for a book which all students of the fourth Gospel should read and ponder.

JAMES S. STEWART

The Biblical Doctrine of Election. By H. H. ROWLEY. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

LET it be said quite frankly that this is not an epoch-making book.

It contains little that has not been said before on the doctrine of Election. It makes little contribution to the philosophical and theological discussions that have raged round this great subject. But, of course, that is not its aim, and if that is kept in mind many readers will agree that Professor Rowley's book is important, notwithstanding its rather serious limitations. The real importance of the book lies, not so much in its contents but in the emphasis which the author has laid upon certain aspects of the subject.

The book sets forth in simple language what the Bible, especially the OT, has to say in regard to Election. The emphasis is on the election of Israel. Indeed of the six chapters the first three deal specifically with God's choice of Israel, the fourth treats of individual election within Israel, while the fifth is concerned with the election of Gentiles before Christ. In these five chapters there is little theological reflection. Dr Rowley's main concern is to set down what the OT teaches about Election, and this he does in language that is simple and direct. In this section of his book the author has supplied many valuable footnotes full of OT scholarship which should be of great exegetical value for both student and preacher. These are so free from technicalities, and are stated with such admirable simplicity, that the layman too will be able to read them with enjoyment and profit.

In the last chapter Dr Rowley deals with the relationship between Christianity and Judaism from the point of view of Election, and demonstrates that there is no essential difference between them. In his view the essential feature in the election of both Jew and Christian is (and herein lies one of the chief values of his book) that it was an election to service—service which involved receiving and cherishing the revelation of God granted to each in historical experiences, manifesting God's character in the life of each, and an obligation to mediate to all men the divine revelation vouchsafed to each.

In this last chapter Professor Rowley has many things to say that are most relevant to the Church's life and witness and that require to be emphasised. The Church today needs to be reminded of the tragic fate of the Laodicean church because of her lukewarmness to which Dr Rowley refers, and then goes on: 'A holy zeal in cherishing the revelation of God given to Israel and in Christ, an eagerness to reflect the character and will of God in every aspect of its life, both corporate and individual, and a passionate devotion to the task of winning the world, are the essential marks of the loyal Church, and the Church that has not these marks is the Church that thereby declares that she does not value her election' (p. 166).

It is this emphasis on the obligations involved in Election that makes this book a message to the Church today. 'To be the elect of God is not to be His pampered favourite. It is to be challenged to a loyalty and a service and a sacrifice that knows no limits, and to feel the constraint of the Divine love to such a degree that no response can seem adequate and no service worthy. The constraint is not of our choosing. It is laid upon us. We can resist it, but if we do so resist it we act disgracefully. For we have received of the grace of God, and its obligation already lies upon us' (p. 168).

On the all-important question of individual election in the Christian sense the author has little to say; indeed only two pages have been devoted to this aspect of the subject. This is, perhaps, the most serious limitation of the book: its emphasis on the OT doctrine of election, to the comparative exclusion of the NT contribution, means that the interest and influence of Dr Rowley's book will be restricted, in the main, to those whose chief concern is the OT. Of the great problems involved in individual election nothing is said, and this is, perhaps, the chief disappointment so far as the theologian is concerned. Nevertheless, Professor Rowley's book is a notable one, and preachers and teachers alike will be grateful to him for the clear statement of what the OT in particular has to say on Election; a statement that loses nothing by the simplicity of language and directness of style with which it is set forth.

J. G. S. S. Thomson

The Bible from Within. By Rev. A. G. Hebert, D.D. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

The question which this book attempts to answer is one that has occasioned much discussion and very deep difference of opinion. It is: How can a man, trained preacher or ordinary layman, be sure that he understands the proper or original meaning of a particular passage of Scripture? How may he arrive at the inner meaning of the Bible? In the opinion of Dr Hebert, the scholarly work of the critics can afford little, if any, help at this level. Their work, invaluable though it is, stops short when it is a question of discovering the 'spiritual', the inner, meaning of a particular passage of Scripture; because at this level the Bible ceases to be a mere text book, mere literature. It becomes, rather, the speaking voice, the 'oracle', of God to the Christian, as it was to the writers of Scripture, and, through them, to their own day and generation. The Problem then is: How can the Bible be made to speak its authentic message to the Christian today?

In brief, Dr Hebert's thesis falls into two parts. The modern reader of the Bible must: (1) realise that the Bible is the record of a

Divine purpose of which Christ was the fulfilment; (2) (*a*) set the particular parts of Scripture against the background of the age for which they were written; (*b*) ask what each of the various writers of Scripture was endeavouring to say to his own generation to and for whom he was writing.

(1) The purpose, of which the Bible is the history, is one that is common to Old and New Testaments alike, and still has relevance for the Christian today. Just as God was at work in the history of ancient Israel so He was and is active within the Church, the new Israel. The purposes which God was pursuing in and through the history of the one were co-extensive and co-terminous with the aims He was pursuing in and through the other; and our Lord was the fulfilment of these Divine purposes. And, in the opinion of Dr Hebert, it is as the unity of the NT Church with the OT Church through the identity of the Divine purpose common to both is realised that the Bible becomes a living word from God to the modern reader.

(2) The second part of Dr Hebert's answer to the question he has under discussion is this: It is not sufficient to try to understand the ancient world to which, e.g., the characters of the OT stories belonged; nor the religious concepts or ethical ideals with which they operated. In his opinion, it is much more important to try to understand the historical situation which faced the men who penned the stories and prophecies of the Bible, and also the needs and aspirations which the writers of Scripture endeavoured to satisfy by what they wrote. To understand aright the stories, the prophecies, the psalms, the proverbs, etc., of the Bible we have to become conversant with the situation that each of the writers of Scripture was facing, and what it was that each was trying to say to his own generation through what he wrote.

After having set forth his thesis, Dr Hebert proceeds to deal with various passages from the historical, the prophetical, and the poetical literature of the OT from this point of view, and endeavours to show how this use of Scripture enables the modern reader to understand the Bible from within, and to reach the inner or spiritual meaning of Scripture. In his treatment of the Creation and Eden stories, e.g., Dr Hebert explains them, not from the standpoint of one who belonged to that distant point in time with which the stories deal, but from the point of view of their authors who wrote them for men who were living in the Exilic and Pre-Exilic periods respectively. Treated from this angle the main purpose of these passages is a theological one; the writers were seeking to present a doctrine of creation and a doctrine of man to the men of their own times.

The Abrahamic stories articulate a living message when they are considered, not so much from the point of view of one who belonged to Abraham's age, but from the standpoint of a writer who was addressing the Israel of Elijah's day when the men of the Northern Kingdom were subject to the tension created by their living in the midst of the Baal-worshipping Canaanites. The story of Jacob was told, not merely to preserve the record of his experiences, but to demonstrate to the writer's own age God's manner of creating a godly character out of unlikely material. So the Joseph stories were told in order to teach constancy in temptation and adversity, and the reality of Divine Providence. These few examples will demonstrate Dr Hebert's treatment of Scripture in order to make the Bible yield up its primary meaning to the modern reader, even although many centuries separate him from the men who wrote the OT.

No one will readily deny the validity of the author's thesis, but some OT scholars will receive his first point with much reserve. Doubtless many would agree with Dr Hebert when he says that what makes the Old and New Testaments a unity is that both record the history of one identical Divine purpose—the coming of Messiah, and that our Lord was the fulfilment of that purpose. But some will hesitate to find Christ in the OT to the extent that the author finds Him (see e.g. p. 166).

But this is a most timely and useful book. It is one which preacher and layman alike will consult with profit, the former in his homiletical use of Scripture and the latter in his handling of the Bible in his devotional hours. Dr Hebert's book is both a warning against extravagance in the allegorical use of Scripture, and a guide to a more intelligent use of the Bible which, if used with restraint, should help many towards an understanding of 'the Bible from within'.

J. G. S. S. THOMSON

The Practice of Evangelism. By BRYAN GREEN. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Success and Failure of a Radio Mission. By R. H. W. FALCONER. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

'OUR PROBLEM,' said the late Archbishop Temple, 'is to envisage the task of the Church in a largely alien world.' The recognition of the truth of that statement by every branch of the Church, and the consequent concern to explore new methods and techniques of approach to the vast mass of non-Churchgoers, is perhaps the most striking and heartening development in the life of the Church in the post-war world. Evangelism is no longer regarded as an occasional activity to be carried out by the specialist. It has become the primary concern of the Church in every aspect of its day-to-day existence. The most searching developments in modern theology are evangelical in their origin. The liturgical revival—so marked in the Scottish Church—has arisen out of a new desire to relate the worship of the Christian community to the common life of men. The dynamic of the Church Extension movement, the restless seeking for new techniques in youth work—these things are part of a genuine evangelical revival which holds immense possibilities for the Church in these challenging days.

The two books under review have both a real contribution to make to the thinking of anyone who is prepared to face the problem of seeing the Church's task in the context of an alien world.

For twenty-five years Mr Bryan Green has been well known as an evangelist, both in this country and abroad. His evangelical work outside his own Birmingham parish has been mainly along the conventional lines of the 'Special Mission'; and it may be that the significance of his book springs from the fact that he is not merely a 'sawdust-trail' evangelist, but a parish priest, involved with the primary responsibility of relating his evangelism to the life and witness of a settled Christian community. Indeed, one has the feeling reading this book that the development of Canon Green's work and thought is a fair reflection of the changing pattern of evangelism in the last three decades.

It has become increasingly obvious that the traditional methods of evangelism are no longer adequate to cope with the peculiar problems of today. The special missioner or occasional preacher has to deal with three immense difficulties. First, he has to win an audience—it is simply a fact that in Scotland at least a public religious meeting no longer draws the non-Churchgoer. Second, even if he does win his audience, the evangelist is faced with the baffling problem of communicating his message to people whose minds are apparently conditioned against it. And third, when men are converted, he has all too often to leave them in a Christian community in which the thrilling and radiant experience of personal salvation is regarded as a quixotic departure from the normal. In other words, he is beaten by the follow-up. Of all these difficulties Canon Green is acutely aware. And his conclusions are exactly in line with a new emphasis common to all branches of the Church as it faces its missionary responsibility.

First, that evangelism cannot be divorced from what Mr Green calls 'the mission of the local Church'. He writes: 'Mass evangelism undoubtedly has its place; parochial missions can make their contribution; a specially gifted evangelist can proclaim his message; the specialist Christian can make his contribution in factory, in politics, and in teaching . . . but in the last analysis it is the worshipping community, that part of the Body of Christ that worships, lives and proclaims the Gospel in all its activities in any given neighbourhood, which is the real evangelising agent used by the Spirit of God. It is here amidst the people that the Church must worship and live its life.'

Second, that the key to evangelism in the modern situation lies in the creation of a lay apostolate, and on this topic Mr Green has some penetrating things to say: 'It is recognised . . . that the lay Apostolate does not mean simply speaking the Gospel either in a public meeting or in a private friendship. It does mean that lay men and women must see themselves as sent out into the world so to live Christ day by day and so to bring their Christian insights to bear within their own profession and daily work that through them Christ shall be seen, and the outsider reached and won.' This is a book which ministers will read with profit, and which could be used as a basis of study by any group within a congregation seeking to meet its missionary responsibilities.

The power of the radio as an instrument for evangelism cannot be over-emphasised. Of all the modern agencies of propaganda, none is more dangerous—or more dominating. With the radio there is no problem of winning an audience—it is there, ready-made. B.B.C. Listener Research investigations show that 50 per cent. to 75 per cent. of those listening to the average morning or evening services are people on the fringe or outside the active fellowship of the Christian Church. Again, it is commonly said that the scandal of the nineteenth century was the loss of the working classes to the Church. In the light of that, it is not without significance that Listener Research estimates that audiences to religious broadcasts are around 70 per cent. working class. Obviously the medium had to be examined in times of evangelism, and in the autumn of 1950 the first large-scale experiment to take place in Britain was carried out in the Scottish Region.

In this little book Mr Falconer—who is Religious Broadcasting Organiser for Scotland—has given a clear, objective and unprejudiced account of the success and failure of the experiment. He examines the principles which underlie religious broadcasting in general, outlines the aims and plan of the Mission, and deals at some length with the reaction of both clergy and laity. Two things emerge quite clearly: first, that radio evangelism, to be fully effective, depends entirely on the active co-operation and support of the local Church. Religious broadcasting has always been regarded by the B.B.C. as 'the hand-maid of the Church'; and it is obvious that a Radio Mission might as well not take place unless the Church and its individual congregations are ready to use the Mission, and receive those who are challenged into the full life of Christian discipleship as members of the Body of Christ. At this point lies probably the greatest disappointment of the 1950 Mission. In Mr Falconer's own words: 'The vast majority of congregations received the Mission passively, and accordingly made little or nothing of it except to observe an increase of attendance at public worship of some hitherto "dormant" members.'

The second thing which Mr Falconer underlines in his book is the immense possibility inherent in the broadcasting of what he calls 'organic experience' in lay groups—a new departure in the sphere of religious broadcasting which reflects the trend in all our thinking. There is nothing more important than the restoration of a vital and dynamic fellowship in the Parish. Whatever technique of evangelism we employ, it has this as its end.

THOMAS ALLAN

The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England. By J. C. DICKINSON. S.P.C.K. 20s.

BY comparison with the Cistercians, the Austin Canons are little known or honoured in Britain, in spite of the fact that both in England and in Scotland their houses greatly outnumbered those of all the Benedictines put together. One may contrast the place of Melrose Abbey in the popular esteem with that accorded to the Priory of St. Andrews. The difference is due in part to Sir Walter Scott, but not to him only. The Austin Canons produced no Bernard or Aelred. Waltheof deserted them to become a Cistercian, though it seems he regretted the step towards the end of his life. The great Victorines, William, Hugh and Richard, make a more limited appeal, but they belong to a section of Augustinians which submitted to Cistercian influence. Nevertheless the Austin Canons of the main stem have something distinctive about them. They deserved to have a historian, and in Mr Dickinson they have found one both erudite and sympathetic.

In this book the origin of the Order is traced to corporations of Secular Clergy, mainly in Central Italy and Southern Germany, which survived the Dark Ages, and which, borne on the tide of asceticism which prepared the way for the Gregorian Reform, began in the eleventh century to hanker after 'the full common life' believed to be primitive and Apostolic. They had no connexion historical or theological with St. Augustine. The author's endeavour, following Fr. Mellet, to maintain that 'the ethos of the regular canons was the ethos of Augustine' is supported by a strangely heavy discounting of the *Confessions* (p. 177). The authenticity of the so-called Rule of St. Augustine is well reviewed here.

The Order was slow in reaching England. Before 1100 it had but three houses, none of them important. But during the reign of Henry I its progress was rapid, forty houses being added including the important one at Aldgate and the interesting experiment at Carlisle, where the Augustinians formed the Chapter of the new Cathedral. This expansion was under Royal patronage and had the blessing of Anselm. Mr Dickinson has few glances north of the Tweed, but it is worth noting that the brothers of Henry's Queen, Maud, gave the order its firm footing in Scotland at the same time. In England the progress continued till 1215 when presumably saturation point had been reached. A full account of this is given in Chapter III.

Chapters IV-VI discuss the observances of the Early Regular Canons, their Status in the ecclesiastical system and their relations with the Secular Clergy. Mr Dickinson defends them, with many a sly dig at their chief rivals, the Cistercians, as representatives of moderation and flexibility, Though technically 'religious', they rejected the ideal of being 'dead to the world'. Though not specially 'learned', they attempted to combine 'true piety and sound learning' in the manner of Elizabethan Anglicans. Mr Dickinson finds that 'for the most part the regular canons sought to accomplish their work, not by direct evangelism (for which the friars were soon to show the burning need) but by the monastic labour . . . the offering of the divine liturgy and the oblation of their own souls as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God'. His period is the twelfth century when pious phrases are still expressive of genuine feeling and intention, but already the hints appear of the weaknesses which were to become yet more obvious later.

With its wealth of detail, its massive learning, its careful sifting of evidence, its balanced judgment and profound insight into Medieval ways of thought and feeling, this book will appeal to the scholar; but its mode of presenting its 'unkindly material', almost chatty at times, must charm and fascinate the general reader.

John H. S. Burleigh

The Church of England—Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed. Church Book Room Press. pp. 65. 2s. 6d.

In this Report of the 115th Islington Conference of 1949 we have four addresses upon the title theme from different aspects. The Rev. Dr Geoffrey Bromiley speaks on the *Church of England's History*; the Rev. J. P. Thornton Duesbery on her *Doctrine*; the Rev. C. W. J. Bowles on her *Worship*; and the Very Rev. J. G. Tiarks on her *Administration*. There is also a short Foreword by the Bishop of

Barking, and the President's Address by the Rev. J. A. G. Dinley.

This is an interesting book because in it we see Evangelicals asserting strongly that the Church of England is by nature an Evangelical and Reformed Church—Catholic also, but evangelically Catholic, so to speak. It is also interesting in that it mirrors the present weaknesses and the promise of the Anglican Evangelicals.

The promise consists largely in this, that very many more Evangelicals are taking to their books. The first three of these four addresses are evidence of that. Only through hard study and thought can come that positive position in the Church known as evangelical. For this reason we are sorry that the President's Address should exhort the conference to be 'practical' and not merely academic (p. 10). It is this Romantic fear of the academic that has crippled 'Evangelicalism' for so long and which, if persisted in, would at last lead to its disappearance in the Church of England. For this reason also we disagree with the Bishop of Barking's diagnosis of 'what is wrong with Evangelicalism today?' 'Certainly,' he says, 'not its doctrine nor its worship. Does the weakness not lie in our characters?' It is no doubt true (according to article 9!) that there is a very real weakness in evangelical characters. But his belief that all is well with evangelical doctrine and worship is astounding. Evangelical doctrine (to take only this) is weak today in two respects—its fossilisation and its fragmentation. By its fossilisation we mean that Evangelicals, with very few exceptions, regard themselves as coming into an inheritance rather than as fighting their way into a position. It is, of course, true that there is an evangelical heritage of doctrine, and for this we should be profoundly grateful. And we should, of course, take it into account and use it. But this business of being an evangelical does not come upon one unawares; it is only won with much toil and fighting. As Ignatius hoped at the last to attain to being a disciple, so we might hope with much spiritual labour and mental discipline to become an evangelical. An evangelical is not he who takes over a certain *corpus theologiae* called 'evangelicalism'. It is he who obeys in theology and Church the evangel of God, the Word of God. And such obedience is not easy.

Secondly, the fragmentation of evangelical theology. By this we mean that 'evangelicalism' holds firmly to certain truths, or perhaps it would be truer to say, to certain formulas—i.e. justification by faith alone; the uniqueness of Christ as Mediator between God and man, and so on. Now, apart from the hiatus between the formula and the actual belief which may often be observed, these insights are too frequently—indeed, almost universally—held as separate fragments, related perhaps to one another, but not related to the other points of belief nor worked out in a coherent and consistent theology. The gravest charge that may be levelled against present evangelical theology is its inconsistency with the formulas which it professes.

In view of this, we deprecate the complacency in regard to the evangelical party which finds expression in this book—except from Mr Bowles. Whatever Evangelicals may have done or suffered for the truth in time past or in time present, it is not for them to draw attention to the fact. Along with much that has been done goes much that has been omitted, much that would have been better omitted. Self congratulation not only does not help, but it positively hinders 'Evangelicalism' from becoming Evangelical in our day. A body must begin where an individual must begin, in penitence. The way to enter into a strong evangelical Church life (which, of course, includes theology) is to stop, to examine our Church life (and, of course, theology) in the light of the Word of God, and guided by our evangelical forefathers. And to do all this radically. Then we shall be able to take up the position this booklet adopts and say: 'Here we stand; we can do no other.' But we cannot say it yet.

T. H. L. PARKER

What the Church of England Stands For. By J. W. C. WAND. Mowbray and Co., 1951. 7s. 6d.

IT IS perhaps a sign of the confusion which has overtaken both members and observers of the Church of England that the need is now felt for various guides to its claims, teaching or authority. The Bishop of London, who has already written on the authority of Scripture, is the latest ecclesiastical leader to undertake this task of guidance, and he does so in a slender volume to which he has given the challenging but somewhat grandiloquent title: *What the Church of England Stands For.*

The task which Dr Wand has set himself is clearly stated in his introductory chapter: he wishes to make it plain what authority may be claimed for the Church of England both as a branch of the universal Church and more specifically as the established Church in England. To the fulfilment of this task he devotes eight main chapters in which he considers successively the position of the Church of England, the nature of authority, authority and the individual, intellectual authority, the sacraments, worship, faith and conduct. In a concluding section he attempts to assess the particular genius or ethos of the Anglican communion and the benefits which it can confer.

With much of what the Bishop says, there will be a fairly general agreement, and we may be grateful to Dr Wand for saying what he does say in this simple and lucid popular form. But it must be recognised that the book is not free from some blatant errors and mis-statements which may give a very false impression of what the Church of England does stand for, and in that way perpetuate misgivings and misunderstandings amongst those who ought to be its friends and brethren. Indeed, in spite of his official position, Bishop Wand does not write as in any true sense the representative of classical Anglicanism, but as the partisan of a group which, not without some success, has attempted to impose its own outlook and teaching upon the English Church.

The keynote of the argument is struck almost at the outset, when Dr Wand draws a misleading contrast between the 'Catholic' and 'Evangelical' Churches, and gives to his own Church a balanced position between the two. The shallowness of his distinctions, of which he himself is uneasily aware, may be seen from the fact that he describes the Protestant emphasis as mainly upon the individual, or from his appallingly misleading simplification that the Catholic Church still taught justification by grace, whereas the new Churches insisted upon justification by faith alone. Perhaps it is a pity that Anglican theologians are no longer trained on Calvin's *Institutes* as many of them once were.

The mischievous nature of the Bishop's argument reveals itself more fully when in two short paragraphs on the Thirty-nine Articles, in his chapter on Intellectual Authority, he makes a reckless attempt to make it appear that the Articles are, after all, more Catholic than Calvinist. On the one hand he argues that the distinctive Reformed Doctrines of Predestination, Original Sin, and the Bondage of the Will are in some way repudiated by Articles IX, X and XVII, not because they reject the Reformed teaching, but because they are understatements. It would be a constructive exercise for the Bishop to compare them with such parallel confessional statements as the Gallican, Belgic and Helvetic Confessions, as the Chaplain of his Elizabethan predecessor, Bancroft, did in the earliest commentary on the Articles. On the other hand he leaves the impression that the Articles may honestly and legitimately be construed in the Catholic sense which Newman later confessed to have forced upon them in Tract XC, in defiance of the fullest and plainest historical evidence. We are not surprised when Dr Wand argues that even the 'formally' Protestant Article on Justification is perhaps rather more Catholic than Calvinist, although the Homily to which it refers us unfortunately does not bear out his suggestion that the Anglican theologians did not mean by justification all that continental theologians included in the term. Who these Anglican theologians were he does not tell us: but he can hardly have been referring to Cranmer, or Jewel, or even Hooker, and most certainly not to their more Calvinistic contemporaries like Hooper, Grindal, Calfhill or Whitaker. In view of these statements, it is not surprising that assent to the Articles is interpreted as a mere acceptance of them as a basis of teaching, which in effect is to make them the traditional nose of wax adaptable to any and every face.

The consequences of Dr Wand's assertions soon appear, for in his chapter on the Sacraments he leaves it to be understood that the Church of England really has seven Sacraments like the Church of Rome, although this view is contrary to the Catechism, the Article, the Homily, the Protestant contention in the Convocation debates under Henry, and the unequivocal statements of individual theologians. In relation to the so-called sacraments of order the Bishop shows some *naïveté* when he professes not to understand the Roman Catholic objection to Anglican orders. With a better understanding of the theology of the Anglican rite, the Roman Catholics perceive that there is no intention to ordain a sacrificing priest who will offer the sacrifice of the Mass. The term 'priest' to which Dr Wand refers does not affect the issue, for in the Latin of the Prayer Book its equivalent both in the Ordinal and in all other services is 'presbyter', not 'sacerdos', and the preface and rubric cited by the Bishop have no bearing on the decisive issue. The Anglican 'priest' is ordained a 'presbyter' in the New Testament and Reformed sense, not a sacrificing priest in the medieval and Tridentine sense.

The fact that attention is necessarily drawn to these more dubious assertions does not mean of course that there is not a good deal of sound teaching and sane counsel in this well-written work. But the mis-statements are unfortunately more important because they are calculated to give a false idea of what the Church of England can and does stand for and thus to hamper rather than strengthen the real and visible unity for which the Bishop impressively pleads. The point is that in utterances of this kind, especially by authoritative leaders, it is necessary to adhere as far as possible to the plain and historical sense of the formularies. With a little ingenuity, the dogmatic and devotional symbols can no doubt be made to fit almost any interpretation, and we can claim the most widely divergent doctrines for the one church. For the individual adherent a certain latitude in interpretation is no doubt desirable. But in public and authoritative statements, there is surely a duty to place the symbols in their true and fairly plain historical content, and not to raise the artificial barriers of individual speculation against a unity which the Anglican Fathers themselves did not think to have been broken. It is because Dr Wand fails at this point that his book must be read with caution and even scepticism, and its judgments subjected to the most rigorous historical inquiry.

G. W. Bromiley

A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Day. By F. Goldie. London: S.P.C.K., 1951. Pp. x, 168. 14s. 6d.

Mr. Goldie's work is a lucid and straightforward compilation, and gives numerous references to the older, more substantial histories and to original sources. The main complaint must be of the book's proportions. In his preoccupation with Statute Law, Codes of Canons, biographies of bishops and the machinery of government, the author tends to neglect other parts of the Church's history, including its doctrines and the conduct of its worship. It seems regrettable that a writer who starts by being critical enough of the lack of leadership shown by the bishops in the generation after the Revolution was not led rather to emphasise that although the Church is episcopal its vitality has not lain solely in the episcopate or in its central institutions.

The research has not yet been undertaken on which an adequate account could be based of the life of the Church—which is so largely the life of the congregations throughout the land. Material is abundant. During the struggle for control of the parishes, following on the Revolution, much Episcopalian history is to be found in the records of the Presbyterian Church courts. Throughout the Jacobite period, an essential, but neglected, source is the indictments of nonjuring clergy before the High Court of Justiciary. As to the juring, or 'qualified', congregations, we have the illuminating remarks of Bishop Pococke. Registers of baptisms and marriages are extant for the eighteenth century (at least four of them printed), while in the nineteenth century congregational records of every kind multiply. Once such sources have been investigated, a small-scale history will be able to give a vivid and comprehensive picture.

Disappointment that Mr Goldie's study could not go further is sharpened by his obvious perception of the significant developments of the last two centuries—developments around which he might have assembled his material had his arrangement not been so dominated by the narrative of the episcopal succession. There was, for instance, the growth of representative government in this episcopal church. As long ago as 1743 the Edinburgh clergy objected that canons should not be enacted by the sole authority of the bishops, and that presbyters should sit in synods not merely to 'hear and propose', but to 'vote decisively'; while early in the nineteenth century John Skinner advocated the extension of responsibility to the laity. In recent time, representation has so developed that it might now be fairly reasoned whether lay men—and women—do not play a more influential part in the Episcopal Church than in the Presbyterian.

Again, Mr Goldie realises that 'one of the outstanding features in the development of the Church in Scotland was its close approximation to the Church of England', but this might have been more fully discussed in relation to the changes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—the disappearance of kirk sessions and the introduction of 'vestries' and churchwardens, the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles, the imposition of the surplice, the displacing of the Scots terms 'presbyter' and 'parson' by the English 'priest' and 'rector'. The twentieth century has seen other tendencies, which, whatever their origin, are not Scottish. An historian of this Scottish Church should explain how it has come about that in the eyes of most Scots it now wears a somewhat exotic look.

It is a great merit of the book that, as Bishop How observes in a Foreword, it is free from 'the harsh recriminations that too often mar the telling of the story of the Church in Scotland'. Not only so, but the author's loyalty to his own church does not preclude him from criticising it. He is critical of the structure of the 'Scottish Liturgy'; of an 'apparently complex administration' which bewilders many congregations and even clergy; of 'missions' which have really become chapels of ease; of clergy who 'make great changes in ceremonial' and then 'leave their charges . . . without being content to stay and build up the life of their congregations'; and of clergy from England who 'make no effort to understand the traditions and heritage of the church'. On the traffic in clergy across the Border one apt remark was made by Primus Skinner a hundred and fifty years ago: the Scottish Church, he said, 'ought to have none else for its ministers but those who expect their reward in a better country than England, and from a Master whose kingdom is not of this world'. May it be that in the subjects of Mr Goldie's strictures the explanation is to be found of the decline in membership of which he writes with concern—a decline desperately serious for a body whose communicants now number little more than 1 per cent of the population?

Lapses from accuracy are few. That she 'did her utmost . . . to seek the continuity of the Episcopal Succession' is a curious remark to make of Mary, Queen of Scots, who conferred one see on a youth of sixteen and another on a superintendent and who initiated the vicious procedure of granting out bishoprics by letters patent without reference to ecclesiastical authority. The Montrose of the 1640s was not a duke. At the Restoration, acceptance of episcopal collation was required only from men presented after 1649, and even so it did not by any means invariably involve 'submission to episcopal ordination'. It is misleading to state that only two Episcopalian clergy 'followed the army of Charles', for no less than nine are numbered among the prisoners of the 'Forty-Five'. It is unnecessary to tell us twice over that George IV was 'particularly struck with the venerable appearance of Bishop Jolly'.

Gordon Donaldson

The Church of South India. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

With a disarming remark about his lack of personal experience of the Church of which he writes, the Bishop of Derby makes public in this volume the Lectures he delivered in 1950 as Lichfield Cathedral Divinity Lecturer. We may well be very glad that he has ventured to do so. A brief history is given here of the movement which culminated in September 1947 in the formation of the Church of South India—'amid great joy in the Lord', as eyewitnesses reported; a million people 'have what they wanted—one Church'.

Besides recording the history of this event, the book refers to documents produced by both the participating Churches and other Churches specially interested and concerned in the proposals, as they carefully scrutinised the steps taken. Some of these documents deserve such memorial as this, before they cease to be readily available. There is further generous allusion to other relevant works, including Gregory Dix's *Idea of the Church in Primitive Liturgies*, and even more copiously Bishop Newbiggin's *The Reunion of the Church.*

Those who know the story and the documents thrown up by this piece of living ecclesiastical history will find the third lecture of greatest interest. It is here that Dr Rawlinson allows his own view and judgment to come to expression. These will not be unknown to readers of his *Problems of Reunion* or unpredictable by them; but they acquire a new pungency and directness when addressed to this real situation. In 1948 the Lambeth Conference found itself divided over the question of bishops, presbyters, and deacons consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India. A majority view held that they should in general be accepted in every part of the Anglican Communion; and the statement of the view appears to the Bishop to be convincing. Another view, however, was held by a substantial minority. According to it, 'it was not yet possible to pass any definite judgment upon the precise status' here involved, or meantime to recommend the ministry thus constituted as generally acceptable. The Bishop ventures to criticise the statement of this view, and a penetrating criticism it is. He summons the past history of Anglicanism to show that the issue is whether the Church of England can really think the regulations and policy of the Church of South India to constitute a 'fatal barrier to the acceptance by Anglicans of the ministry of such ministers of the Church of South India as have been episcopally ordained', and to dispose curtly but with justice of the silly suggestion that a 'wholly novel doctrine of the ministry' lies behind these regulations and policy. He then urges that the minority view virtually rules out 'all forms of intercommunion between Churches not holding identical doctrines', in plain defiance of the principle laid down in the recent Concordat between the Church of England and the Old Catholic Church, that identity of opinion in all doctrinal matters was not a prerequisite for intercommunion. And third the Bishop points out that in at least some quarters the validity of orders in the Church of South India is denied, on the ground that there is 'no explicit intention on the part of the Church to ordain priests capable of offering the eucharistic sacrifice'—precisely the ground on which the validity of Anglican orders is contested and rejected by the Roman Church.

Before concluding his book with an Appendix which sets out the Service of the Eucharist in the Church of South India—a liturgy in which at points the influence of the Form and Order of the Scottish Book of Common Order may be traced—the Bishop suggests that in fact there are indications which suggest that the 'majority' position is gaining the victory. The actual present position, he holds, tacitly admits that there is no theological distinction 'between ministers consecrated or ordained in almost exactly the same way and by bishops standing in the same episcopal succession and now ministering side by side in the same Church'.

The whole book displays a spirit of scrupulous and friendly scholarship of which we cannot have enough, and should materially advance both the knowledge and the understanding of this latest manifestation of the ecumenical movement.

J. K. S. Reid

Congregational Praise. Independent Press, 1951. Pp. 1034. 18s. 6d.
I'll Praise My Maker. By Erik Routley. Independent Press, 1951. Pp. 280. 15s.

Of recent hymn-books, *Congregational Praise* has one of the most attractive appearances. It is the largest published for some years—at the largest price. The contents are equally attractive, the typography being clear and easily read. The selection of hymns and of tunes is very catholic, including much excellent material from many communions, Eastern as well as Western. Hymns both old and new are here, while the music draws largely on the French Church Tunes, the various Psalters, especially the Scottish and the Genevan, and offers a number of new tunes. Many will regret the absence of plain-song melodies. It is interesting to find a selection of Scottish metrical psalms, sixteen in number, many of the best-loved verses being here. The section of canticles, psalms and scripture passages for chanting is also very useful, while the presence of the ferial and festal responses may encourage an order of worship in which the congregation will take a larger part.

The volume will be welcomed by Congregationalists, for it is a great improvement in every way on the 1916 Hymnary. But members of all communions will find here much to interest them and to stimulate their spiritual aspirations. The committee under the Rev. K. L. Parry has been working for some seven years, while the musical advisory body had Dr Eric Thiman as Chairman. All concerned are to be congratulated on a fine achievement.

Erik Routley, who was a member of the musical committee, has given us a fine 'study of the hymns of certain authors who stand in or near the tradition of English Calvinism 1700-1850'. These are chiefly Philip Doddridge, William Cowper, John Newton, James Montgomery, and Josiah Conder. Those who know the author's excellent book *The Church and Music*, will be prepared for this fresh and interesting commentary on the literary and hymnological works of the period. The present volume, which deserves a longer review than is possible here, makes an excellent companion to *Congregational Praise*, though a formal handbook to that is in preparation. But this work should be read and pondered by all budding and flowering hymnologists. When they have studied it, they will look forward eagerly to the same writer's promised work on *The Hymns in History*.

John A. Lamb

GTU Library
3 2400 00284 6594

THREE DAY
92263
Scottish journal of theology
v.5
1952

Scottish journal of theology
v.5
1952

THREE DAY

92263

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709